

THIS FILE IS MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE DECLASSIFICATION EFFORTS AND RESEARCH OF:

THE BLACK VAULT

THE BLACK VAULT IS THE LARGEST ONLINE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT / GOVERNMENT RECORD CLEARING HOUSE IN THE WORLD. THE RESEARCH EFFORTS HERE ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DECLASSIFICATION OF THOUSANDS OF DOCUMENTS THROUGHOUT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT, AND ALL CAN BE DOWNLOADED BY VISITING:

[HTTP://WWW.BLACKVAULT.COM](http://www.blackvault.com)

YOU ARE ENCOURAGED TO FORWARD THIS DOCUMENT TO YOUR FRIENDS, BUT PLEASE KEEP THIS IDENTIFYING IMAGE AT THE TOP OF THE .PDF SO OTHERS CAN DOWNLOAD MORE!



the national archives

(c) crown copyright

Registered File Disposal Form

MOD Form 262F
(Revised 9/01)

FILE TITLE: (Main Heading - Secondary Heading - Tertiary Heading etc)

UFO'S - FOI REQUESTS

Reference:
(Prefix and Number):

D1 DAS/64/6

Part: A

PROTECTIVE MARKING (including caveats & descriptors):

UNCLASSIFIED

Date of last enclosure:

20 DEC 07

Date closed:

2 JAN 08

PART 1. DISPOSAL SCHEDULE RECOMMENDATION

(To be completed when the file is closed)

~~Destroy after _____ years~~

~~Forward to INFO(EXP)-R after _____ years~~

~~No recommendation~~

FOR DEFENCE INFO(EXP)-R USE ONLY

Date of 1st review

Date of 2nd review

Forward Destruction Date

Reviewer's

Signature: _____

Reviewer's

Signature: _____

PART 2. BRANCH REVIEW

(To be fully completed at time of file closure)

(Delete as appropriate)

a. Of no further administrative value and not worthy of permanent preservation. DESTROY IMMEDIATELY (Remember that TOP SECRET and Codeword material cannot be destroyed locally and must be forwarded to INFO(EXP)-R.)

b. (i) To be retained until the end of the year _____ for the following reason(s):

LEGAL

CONTRACTUAL

FINANCE/AUDIT

DIRECTORATE POLICY

DEFENCE POLICY + OPERATIONS

ORIGINAL COMMITTEE PAPERS

MAJOR EQUIPMENT PROJECT

OTHER (Specify)

FOR PERMANENT RETENTION ✓

DO NOT

DESTROY

✓ U.F.O.

(ii) Key enclosures which support the recommendation are:

UFS RELATED FILE - RETAIN ON
PERMANENT BASIS. Do NOT
DESTROY.

(iii) At the end of the specified retention period the file is to be:

Destroyed

Considered by DR for
permanent preservation

c. Of no further administrative value but worthy of consideration by INFO(EXP)-R for permanent preservation.

PART 3. BRANCH REVIEWING OFFICER (not below C2/equivalent)

Signature: 

Name: 

(Block Capitals)

Grade/Rank: B2 Date: 2 JAN 08

Branch Title and Full Address:

DAS-SEC A1
OS-4-15
MAIN BUILDING

Tel No: 

PART 4 DESTRUCTION CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the specified file has been destroyed.

Signature: _____

Name: _____

(Block Capitals)

Grade/Rank: _____ Date: _____

Witnessed by (TOP SECRET* and SECRET only)


Signature: _____

Name: _____

(Block Capitals)

Grade/Rank: _____ Date: _____

*(FOR DR USE ONLY)



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 26-11-2007-085625-001

Expiry: 24 Dec 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Copy of MoD responses to FOI requests 08-10-2007-090830-001 and 07-11-2007-155411-001

Case for release of information

There is no objection to the release of this material.

Some personal information has been withheld under exemption s.40

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to release the aforementioned information

Grade/Rank: B2 Name:..... **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date:..... 20/12/07



From: Section 40
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) Section 40
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Merton Abbey
London

Section 40

Our Reference

26-11-2007-085625-001

Date

20 December 2007

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 25 November 2007 asking for copies of the MoD responses to FOI requests 08-10-2007-090830-001 and 07-11-2007-155411-001.

I attach copies of the relevant responses. You will note that some personal details such as names and addresses have been withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 December 2007 11:32
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST - 07-11-2007-155411-001

Attachments: R - FILES FOR RELEASE.pdf

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your Freedom of information request of 7 November 2007 which raised a number of questions regarding the administration of the release of the DIS and DAS UFO files. I will deal with them in order.

Q1. What is the redaction policy for documents released as a result of this initiative. Will public and/or official names be withheld?

Documents released under the upcoming programme will be released in accordance with existing Freedom of Information principles and guidelines.

Q2. Will they be available in paper or digital form at the National Archive?

It is the intention to make both the DAS and DIS files available in digital format through TNA "Doc-Online" service. However, as the DAS original files were created in paper, these files will be transferred to TNA and made available to the public in that format in due course. The original DIS paper files were contaminated by asbestos and have been destroyed in accordance with health and safety requirements now that they have been reconstituted in electronic format. However, a paper version will be made available to the public in TNA shortly after the transfer of the electronic file.

Q3. Have the TNA agreed to collect these documents as they released?

TNA will accept the transfer of these records as they are released by MOD. However, there is an internal process that the records have to undergo at TNA before they can be made available to the general public. It is not envisaged that there will be any significant delays in placing the redacted electronic files on Docs Online.

Q4. If the documents are redacted, will the unredacted versions be available as per current arrangements i.e. under the 30 year rule?

At this early stage in the project, almost all redactions made are under FOIA s.40 (i.e. names of officials and names/addressees of those reporting UFO sighting), and as such will remain closed for the usual period of 30 years. However, there may be some instances where other sensitivities are found to exist, so it is not possible at this time to declare with absolute certainty that all redactions will be available after 30 years.

Q5. If FOI requests are to be included do you mean the original request, the responses or both?

It is intended that both the original request and answer will be released. Names and addresses of requesters will be withheld.

Q6 What will be the most recent dates on released material under this initiative?

Material released over the coming years will include documents up to and including 2007.

Q7. Can you please provide a list of files it is intended to release?

I attach a list of those closed files the MoD will be releasing. You will note that the titles of a number of files have been partially redacted. This is because the titles contain the names of correspondents which are being withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Files A-W on series D/DAS/10/2/8/13 are entitled "Information Management - Defence Information Management - The Freedom of Information Act - Requests for Information". However, for reasons of space, I have shortened the titles on the attached spreadsheet to "FOI Requests".

Q8. Will this planned release affect FOI requests for material which is intended for release?

All FOI requests will be considered on an individual basis, but the MoD will apply exemption s.22 (Information intended for Future Publication) if it deems it appropriate. As I am sure you will appreciate, the more time that is spent answering individual FOI requests, the longer the release programme will take.

Q9. Which files are intended for release in the first tranche and is there a provisional date for that release.

Currently a range of files are being reviewed and prepared for release. Until these administrative procedures have been completed and the Lord Chancellor's Advisory Council has approved the necessary Lord Chancellor's Instruments it is not possible to advise you which files will be released in the first tranche or to set a provisional date for their release.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk).

Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Yours sincerely,


DAS-FOI

Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

DAS FILES FOR RELEASE

<u>Prefix</u>	<u>File Number</u>	<u>Part</u>	<u>Title</u>
D/DS8/	10/209/1	C	General Briefs & Reports, UFO Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/1	A	Unidentified Flying Objects - Policy
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	B	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	C	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	D	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	E	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	F	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	G	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	H	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	I	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	J	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	K	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	L	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	M	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	N	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	O	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2/1	A	UFOs Report of Sighting Rendlesham Forest December 1981
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	A	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	B	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	C	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	D	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	E	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	F	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	G	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	H	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	I	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	J	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	K	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	L	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	M	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	N	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	O	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	P	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	Q	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	R	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/4	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Parliamentary Questions & Enquiries
D/Sec(AS)	12/4	B	UFOs - Parliamentary Questions & Enquiries
D/Sec(AS)	12/5	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Close Encounters, Alien Entities, Abductions
D/Sec(AS)	12/6	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Alleged UFO Incident Crash of Lightning F6 8 Sep 70
D/Sec(AS)	12/7	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Incident 31 March 1993
D/DAS(Sec	64/1	A	UFOs - Policy

)		
D/DAS(Sec 64/1	B	UFOs – Policy
)		
D/DAS(Sec 64/1	C	UFOs – Policy
)		
D/DAS(Sec 64/1	D	UFOs – Policy
)		
D/DAS(Sec 64/1	E	UFOs – Policy
)		
D/DAS(Sec 64/1/1	A	UFOs - Policy - Selected Papers (1974-1995)
)		
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	A	Unidentified Flying Objects – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	B	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	C	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	D	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	E	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	F	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	G	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	H	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	I	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	J	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS(Sec 64/2	K	Unidentified Flying Objects Sighting reports
)		
D/DAS(Sec 64/2	L	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
)		
D/DAS(Sec 64/2	M	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
)		
D/DAS/ 64/2	N	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	O	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	P	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	Q	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	R	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	S	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	T	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	U	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	A	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	B	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	C	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	D	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	E	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	F	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	G	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	H	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	I	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	J	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	K	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	L	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	M	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	N	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	O	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	P	UFOs – Public Correspondence

D/Sec(AS) 64/3	Q	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	R	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	S	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	T	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	U	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	V	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	W	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	X	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	Y	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	Z	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	AA	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	AB	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	AC	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	AD	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/1	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/1	B	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/2	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/3	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/4	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/5	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/6	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/7	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/8	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/9	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/10	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/DAS/ 64/3/11	A	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/DAS/ 64/3/11	B	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/DAS/ 64/3/11	C	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/DAS/ 64/3/11	D	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/DAS/ 64/3/11	E	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/DAS/ 64/3/12	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/DAS/ 64/3/13	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/14	A	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/15	A	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/15	B	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/16	A	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/4	A	UFOs – Parliamentary Questions & Enquiries
D/Sec(AS) 64/4	B	UFOs – Parliamentary Questions & Enquiries
D/Sec(AS) 64/4	C	UFOs – PQs/Pes
D/Sec(AS) 64/4	D	UFOs – PQs/Pes
D/Sec(AS) 64/4	E	UFOs – PQs/Pes
D/Sec(AS) 64/4	F	UFOs – PQs/Pes
D/DAS(Sec 64/4)	G	UFOs – PQs/Pes
D/Sec(AS) 64/5	A	UFOs – Press Cuttings
D/DAS/ 10/2/8/13	A	FOI Requests
D/DAS/ 10/2/8/13	B	FOI Requests
D/DAS/ 10/2/8/13	C	FOI Requests

D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	D	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	E	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	F	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	G	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	H	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	I	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	J	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	K	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	L	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	M	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	N	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	O	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	P	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	Q	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	R	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	S	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	T	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	U	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	V	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	W	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	X	Freedom of Information - Requests for Information
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	Y	FOI Requests for Information requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	Z	FOI Requests for Information requests

**DIS FILES FOR
RELEASE**

D/DI55/	108/15/1/32		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/34		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/35		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/36	A	UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/36	B	UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/37		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/38		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/39		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/40		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/41		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/42		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/43		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/44		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/45		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/46		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/47		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/48		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/49		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/50		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/51		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/52		UFO - Incidents

D/DI55/	108/15/1/53		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/54		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15	4	UFO - Policy
D/DI55/	108/15	5	UFO - Policy
D/DI55/	108/15	6	UFO - Policy

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: 01 November 2007 16:02
 To: [REDACTED]
 Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-090830-001
 Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 5 October 2007 asking whether the MoD had decided to release the UFO files held by both DI55 and DAS. Additionally, you asked for details of how and when the department intends to implement this release and for access to records of any discussions relating to this release that have taken place since January 2007.

There are some 160 DAS and DI55 files that deal with the subject of UFOs dating back to the 1970s and it has been decided to place them in the National Archive over the next three years, commencing, it is hoped, in Spring 2008. The release will be undertaken on a rolling programme in chronological order, starting with the oldest files first and will also include Freedom of Information requests received since 2005 relating to UFOs.

Regarding your request for access to documents of any discussions within MoD on the release of files, I can inform you that the Ministry of Defence holds relevant material but we believe this information, which discusses the formulation of MoD policy, falls within the scope of a qualified exemption of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This is exemption S.35 (Formulation of Government Policy). As a qualified exemption, it is necessary for the Ministry of Defence to consider whether there are overriding reasons why disclosure would not be in the public interest.

The Freedom of Information Act requires us to respond to requests promptly and in any case no later than 20 working days after receiving your request. However, when a qualified exemption applies to the information and the public interest test has to be conducted, the Act allows the time for response to be longer than the 20 working days. A full response must be provided within such time as is reasonable in all circumstances of the case and, in response to your requests, it is therefore planned to let you have a final decision on where the balance of public interest lies, by 14 December 2007. However, I would hope that the matter can be resolved quicker than that and I will push for an early response.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Finally, my response of 25 June 2007 to your previous request on this subject, treated exemption s.35 as an *absolute* rather than a *qualified* exemption and therefore failed to point out the need for a formal public interest test. Please accept my apologies for this mistake.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

DAS-FOI
05-H-Section 40
MoD Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 December 2007 15:31
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-090830-001
Dear [REDACTED]

In my response dated 1 November 2007 to your Freedom of Information request reference 08-10-2007-090830-001, I explained that access to documents of any internal discussions within MoD regarding the release of MoD UFO/UAP files was exempted under exemption s.35 (Formulation of Government Policy), and that additional time was required to conduct a public interest test.

Section 35(1)(a) of the Act provides that information may be exempt from disclosure if it would, or would be likely to, prejudice the formulation or development of government policy. The decision to proactively release such a large number of files to the National Archive, was quite clearly a matter of government policy.

This is not the end of the matter, of course; section 35 is a qualified exemption, meaning that the MOD must assess the balance of public interest in release of the information. We have done this at several levels:

- i. There is an undoubted public interest in the public being able to assess the quality of advice being given to ministers and subsequent decision making based on that advice. Given the level of interest in the matter amongst a small but vociferous section of the public, and the probability that ill informed speculation and conspiracy theories are likely to be rife, it is reasonable that the public have a right to know why the Ministry of Defence has made its decision to release the UFO/UAP files.
- ii. Greater transparency makes government more accountable to the electorate and increases trust; if by releasing these discussion papers we were to demonstrate that the decision to proceed was one taken on good advice and following a sensible debate, this may have a positive effect in increasing public confidence in government decision-making. However, if the advice and debate behind policy-making were routinely disclosed, officials may be less willing to offer frank advice or ministers may be less willing to explore the full range of policy options. There is a risk that officials could come under pressure not to challenge ideas in the formulation of policy, thus leading to poorer decision making. Ministers and officials also need to be able to conduct rigorous and candid risk assessments of their policies in a free space without constant scrutiny. Discussions surrounding the release of these files are still on going. This is a major exercise, which I believe is unique in MoD history. The MoD will be proactively placing a large number of files less than 30 years old in the National Archive in both paper and importantly, electronic format. The practical difficulties of this are still under discussion and may well continue to be for some time. As we work on the transfer of these files to the National Archive, we are coming across a number of challenges and need to be able to discuss and seek solutions without the concern that our discussions will be placed in the public domain while this process is ongoing.

Taking the above arguments into account, in this case, we believe that it would not be in the public interest to disclose the discussion documents surrounding the decision to place the DIS and DAS UFO/UAP files in the National Archive. That having been said,

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

I believe that it will be helpful if I provide you with a little more background as to why the decision was taken. Once a policy decision has been taken and the policy implemented, the position can be reconsidered and it may be that any factual background information can then be disclosed.

The subject of UFOs is one of the most popular subjects for FOI requests. Answering requests takes a considerable amount of time and resources and can involve officials in days of work, which frequently means trawling through old files to find the information requested. By placing the UFO files on-line at the National Archive in a structured manner, the MoD is able to follow its remit for more open government and, by re-directing applicants to the National Archive site, reduce the amount of time it spends answering requests. By opening our files in this way, we may also help to counter the maze of rumour and frequently ill informed speculation that surrounds the role of the MoD in the UFO phenomena.

I am sure that you will be disappointed with this response, however, if you have any more specific questions, I will attempt to answer them.


DAS-FOI
05-H-**Section 40**
MoD Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

Section 40

26-11-2007-085625-001

From: Section 40

24 Dec 07

Sent: 25 November 2007 09:51

To: Section 40

Subject: FOI Request

Section 40

I'd be grateful for a copy of the response to the following RFIs, relating to the release of UFO files:

08-10-2007-090830-001

07-11-2007-155411-001

Best wishes,

Section 40

54

AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: Section 40

Case Number: 19-12-2007-102429-001

Expiry: 18/01/08

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Section 40 has asked for more details of three sighting reports from South Wales that were sent to her on the 26th November 2007.

Case for release of information

There is no extra information, but I have copied and redacted the reports sent before to Section 40. Names, addresses and telephone numbers have been removed in accordance with exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the release of the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: Section 40

Signature: Section 40

Date: 19/12/07



From: **Section 40**

Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

Section 40

Reporter – South Wales Echo
Thomson House
Havelock Street
Cardiff
South Glamorgan CF10 1XR

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

19-12-2007-102429-001

Date:

19 December 2007

Dear **Section 40**

I am writing with reference to your Freedom of Information request asking for more details of three sighting reports, from South Wales.

Due to previous correspondence, you will know our policy on UFOs.

The sighting reports that were sent to you before on the 26th November 2007, have all the details that were passed to this office on the DAS answerphone. There is no extra information that I can pass on to you. When we take a message, all the details are immediately input on to our report form.

I have enclosed copies of three sighting reports mentioned for the dates above. Names, addresses and telephone numbers have been removed in accordance with exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days on the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

✓

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	20 February 2005 09.50L
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Bright blue object, broke into about three to four pieces, before disappearing.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Not given.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	Not given.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Not given.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Cardiff South Wales [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11.	Other witnesses.	Not given.
12.	Remarks.	Not given.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	22 February 2005 14.40L

✓

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	8 September 2004 20.15L
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Large flash of light which turned into a grey object descending over Cardiff bay, with trailing smoke behind it.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Not given.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	Just said over Cardiff bay.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Going quite fast as it was descending.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Cardiff Police Control Room, who then in turn left a message on the Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; width: 150px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Canton Cardiff South Wales <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>
11.	Other witnesses.	Not given.
12.	Remarks.	PC <div style="background-color: black; width: 80px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div> that left the message on the Das answerphone, said he contacted the Coast guard, being that Cardiff is a coastal area and enquired if there were any aircraft over the bay, that day, i.e. from a base and the Coast guard said no. Being that the object was spotted over the bay aswell. Also said he spoke to Air Traffic Control - Cardiff, but didn't say on the message of what the outcome was.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	9 September 2004 11.30L

✓

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	Date and time not given.
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Not given.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Not given.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	Not given.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Not given.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	[REDACTED] Grange Town Cardiff South Wales [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11.	Other witnesses.	Not given.
12.	Remarks.	Not given.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	28 July 2005 14.30L

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 17 December 2007 11:42
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 07-11-2007-073339-006

Can you deal

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 17 December 2007 09:31
To: Section 40
Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 07-11-2007-073339-006

Dear Section 40

Thank you for the information in regards to my FOI request about UFO sightings. It is very thorough and I appreciate your efforts. However, there is one small thing missing. In regards to the sightings in Cardiff, I need to know what area/district of Cardiff as obviously it is a big city and need to narrow it down a little bit.

It is not to track down the reporter of the sighting, but just to give a more precise location than just Cardiff as we have to do in all of our stories.

It is only for three sightings so I wondered if it was not too much trouble if you could assist me as soon as possible.

The date and time of sightings are:

- ✓ * 20 February, 2005: 09.50L in Cardiff.
 - ✓ * 8 September 2004. 20.15L Cardiff.
 - ✓ * Sighting with little information, no date or time given, no exact location given, reported to DAS answerphone.
- Date and time of receipt: 28 July 2005. 14.30L

Thank you very much,
Best Wishes,

Section 40

Reporter
South Wales Echo

T: Section 40

F:

Section 40

PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF E-MAIL ADDRESS

Section 40

08/11/2007 09:54

To: Section 40
cc:
Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 07-11-2007-073339-006

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 7 November 2007 asking for details of UFO

17/12/2007

sighting reports from Cardiff, Bridgend, Caerphilly, Merthyr Tydfil and Rhondda Cynon Taff.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

The MoD files on this subject go back to the late 1970s. Copies of UFO correspondence and reports are not held geographically, but are filed in the order in which they are received. Before any of this information can be released, personal data has to be removed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. Clearly, if we were to search for and then process copies of all these reports the costs would quickly exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request. However, if you can narrow the scope of your request to one or two specific years, we may be able to help you.

However, details of sighting reports for the years 1998 to 2006, are held on the Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website. This can be accessed via the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomofInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports. I suspect that this will give you much of the information you are looking for. Details of sightings for 2007 will be placed on the website early in 2008.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

I am sorry I was unable to be of more assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building


London

SW1A 2HB

IMPORTANT NOTICE This email (including any attachments) is meant only for the int

Any views or opinions in this email are solely those of the author and do not nec

Trinity Mirror PLC is the parent company of the Trinity Mirror group of companies



AUTHORISATION TO WITHHOLD REQUESTED INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 26-11-2007-072100-009

Expiry:

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Section 40 has asked for information detailing UFO sightings or reports within the UK for dates – 16 June 2007 and 3 November 2007.

Case for withholding information

The information is being withheld due to the fact that reports for this current year will be placed on the website in January 2008. Therefore, as provided by exemption s.22 (information intended for future publication) of the Freedom Of Information Act 2000.

Proposed use of the following FOI Exemptions

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: **Section 40**

Signature: **Section 40**

Date: 7/12/07

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 07 December 2007 11:55
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-Authorised: FOI Request - 26-11-2007-072100-009

Dear Section 40

I am writing concerning your Freedom of Information request asking for details of UFO sightings or reports within the UK for the dates 3 November 2007 and 16 June 2007. Your request has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to UFOs.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

With regard to your request asking for information detailing UFO sightings or reports for the dates 16 June and 3 November 2007, the MOD has a website, <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomofInformation/PublicationScheme>, on which reports for this current year will be placed on in January 2008. Therefore, as provided by exemption s.22 (information intended for future publication) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the MOD is not obliged to comply with your request.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1986 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days on the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information 1
5th Floor, Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

07/12/2007

mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

EXP 24 DEC 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 25 November 2007 12:15
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 26-11-2007-072100-009 Lowe

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Sunday,
November 25, 2007 at 12:15:03

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: Section 40

txtorganisation: Birmingham UFO Group

txtaddress1: Section 40

txtaddress2:

txttowncity: birmingham

txtstatecountry: west midlands

txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: Section 40

txtinforequest: Please supply any information detailing ufo sightings
or reports with in the uk for dates:

3rd November 2007

and

16th June 2007

Thank you

AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 21-11-2007-112507-002 Expiry: 17 Dec 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Copy of material released in previous FOI response on crop circles.

Case for release of information

There is no objection to the release of this material.

Some personal information has been withheld under exemption s.40

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to release the aforementioned information

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date: 7/12/07

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 07 December 2007 09:59
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 21-11-2007-112507-002
Attachments: Section 40

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 18 November 2007 asking for a copy of material sent to another member of the public in 2007. If I understand you correctly, the relevant request was raised in 2006 and related information on crop files held for the period 1991-95. If this is incorrect, please let me know. You also asked whether the MoD holds information on crop circles.



The MoD answered five Freedom of Information requests to date during 2007, excluding those raised by yourself.

One relates to 1990 and is therefore outside the scope of your request. Three relate to the existence of a MoD file on crop circles and our responses confirm that the MoD has no record of any such file having been created. I have made the assumption that you are not interested in these requests but if I am incorrect, please let me know. This leaves one request in which information held by the MoD for the year 1991 was released to a member of the public. This request was received in December 2006 and I therefore assume that it is the one you refer to. You will note that names, addresses and telephone numbers have been withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, including some that were erroneously released in the original response. Security classifications have been removed as they are no longer relevant. You should also note that the copyright for non MoD documents contained in the information provided is not held by the MoD. If you intend to reproduce or publish them, you should seek legal advice before doing so.

I can also confirm that the MoD does hold information related on crop circles. The majority of the information will be held on our correspondence files (the 12/3 and 64/3 series), although some may also be on our sighting report files (12/2 and 64/2 series). In addition to that, information relating to crop circles can be found on the FOI files held by this office, although this is largely re-cycled information from the correspondence and sighting reports files.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

07/12/2007

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

das-ufo-office@mod.uk

e-mail

Our Reference

08-01-2007-101817-003

Date

09 January 2007

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing in response to your revised Freedom of Information request dated 19 December 2006 for information held on file relating to crop circles for the year 1991.

I attach copies of documentation relating to crop circles for the year 1991. You will notice that the names and signatures of some individuals have been removed as they do not form a substantive part of your request. Additionally, you will note that words have been blacked out at the top and bottom of the signal dated 21 July 1991. These were security classifications which are now no longer relevant.

If you are unhappy with this response or wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact the undersigned in the first instance. Should you remain dissatisfied, then you may apply for an internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail: Info-XD@mod.uk).

If you are still unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not normally investigate your case until the MOD internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct Dialling) [redacted]
(Switchboard) [redacted]
(Fax) [redacted]

Mr [redacted]
Hon. Secretary
Centre for Crop Circle Studies
[redacted]
[redacted]

Your reference

Our reference
D/Sec(AS)12/3

Date
8 August 1991

Dear Mr [redacted]

Thank you for your letter of 6 August, on the subject of a recent crop circle occurrence in Cambridgeshire. [redacted]s letter crossed in the post with my reply to your earlier letter.

As I explained in this previous letter, there is no Ministry of Defence involvement in crop circle research. I can confirm that an RAF aircraft was in the area at the time you mentioned, but, again, can give you a catagoric assurance that its presence was entirely unconnected with the presence of any crop circles. RAF aircraft routinely fly from bases in this area, and there was nothing out of the ordinary about this flight.

Once again, I wish you luck with your studies.

Yours sincerely

[redacted signature]

From: [redacted], Secretariat (Air Staff)2a, Room [redacted]

places at universities, technicians and colleges be published exclusively *The Independent* and *The Independent on Sunday* in the coming weeks.

The first list of vacancies to be in *The Independent* on Tuesday and a further list to be in the next issue of *Independent on Sunday*.

Today's Business on Sunday, Sarah Strickland explains what students should expect after hearing their A-level results if they are still wanted and there are eight bits of information about the new courses.

CONTENTS

VS	
News	2-10
Sign news	12-16
Life Story	17
Critics	18, 19
Life	20
Norman's book	21
ers	21
ling articles	22
view:	
quis de Sade	23
Ascherson	23
.....	24-30
ther	9
DAY REVIEW	
NESS ON SUNDAY	
..... Review, Back Page	
words ... 25; Review, 45	

Ministers have kept quiet about the possibility of abandoning the standards, which were last revised in 1981. They have announced only that they are carrying out a review of the standards, which lay down minimum classroom space for each pupil, require "reasonable resistance to rain, snow, wind and damp" and specify numbers of washrooms and toilets.

The news that abolition is being considered slipped out unnoticed last week in a National Audit Office report. The report revealed that nearly half Britain's seven million schoolchildren are taught in buildings that need urgent repairs and refurbishment. Sir John Bourn, the Comptroller and Auditor General, said that the condition of buildings was having "adverse effects on the quality of education".

little change since 1986 when a Department of Education survey found that more than £2bn was needed to bring school buildings up to the standards required by the 1981 regulations.

In October last year, John MacGregor, then Secretary of State for Education, announced the review of the standards in a press notice which also said that "the transitional period" for compliance would be extended from 1991 to 1996. A spokesman for Jack Straw, the shadow education secretary, said yesterday: "At a stroke, MacGregor moved the goalposts. Now it would appear that Kenneth Clarke, his successor, is planning to abolish the football pitch."

In his press notice, Mr MacGregor said that the review would consider the regulations "in the light of changes in educational practice over the last 10 years" and assess "the implica-

By Anthony Bevins and Ngalo Crequer

tions for school premises of the national curriculum over the next 10 years". It would also examine how requirements would be affected by new laws which give schools money, previously held by local authorities, to carry out their own repairs and maintenance.

Last week's audit office report repeated the press notice word for word but inserted the sentence: "The review will also consider whether there is any need for regulations." The press notice had continued: "The review will report to the Secretaries of State for Education and Wales who will then consider any recommendations for bringing the regulations up to date." Again, the audit office repeated the sentence but added three words - "or abolishing them".

Roy Hattersley, Labour's dep-

uty leader, said: "I can think of no change in educational practice in the last decade that makes leaking roofs or broken windows acceptable. This review is a sham to allow government to absolve itself of responsibilities to parents and children." Her Majesty's Inspectorate said in February that the national curriculum would need even better accommodation.

A spokesman for the Department of Education defended the decision not to mention abolition as an option, arguing that a review was bound to consider all options.


The regulations, which were extended in 1989 to schools that opt out of local authority control, are wide-ranging. As well as adequate classroom space, sufficient toilets and weatherproof buildings, they say there must be changing accommodation available for children taking PE, readily accessible from the school grounds. There should be showers for staff teaching PE if the

school has pupils aged over eight. There should be a room available for the medical or dental examination of pupils during school hours. Every school should have a head teachers' room, and a room for teachers "for social purposes".

Paul White, Tory chairman of the Association of County Councils education committee, said he would be surprised if minimum standards were abolished. "I think they will be changed but kept on in some way. Some of the regulations are absurd. In a small primary school you do not need to build a shower for the staff. These regulations are a bit crazy, they are terribly expensive. You need some laws, but not these."

However, Jim Keight, leader of Knowsley council in Yorkshire, said: "If they abolish the minimum standards they are saying 'to hell with it, it does not matter what the school buildings are like.'"

Crop circles take to the underground



MYSTERIOUS circles similar to those found in crop-fields around the world have been discovered in the bowels of Tokyo's underground system.

Though smaller in size than their rural brethren, the metro circles appear similarly symmetrical, and often in the linked patterns that have excited scientists, "cerealogists" and UFO-watchers. They appear in dust in the tunnels that has not been disturbed for 25 years.

But alien or supernatural forces cannot be blamed for the circles, according to Professor Yoshi Hiko Ohtsuki, the scientist who has revealed them. Instead

By Alex Renton

he thinks they and crop circles are caused by eddying currents of air, possibly electrically charged.

Professor Ohtsuki, who visited British cornfields with a research team this summer, claims to have already created a "plasma vortex" with microwaves and air in his laboratory at Waseda University in Japan. He has used it to make circles appear in trays of aluminium filings.

Japanese television film of these circles was shown at the Sixth International Congress on UFOs in Sheffield this weekend.

It also revealed the dust circles on the walls and floor of the Japanese underground system - causing some distress to the non-sceptical "ufologists" at the conference who had liked to believe that the crop circles were perpetrated by UFOs.

Even the most optimistic were unwilling to suggest that aliens might wish to use their own craft in such an efficient transport system as the Tokyo metro. Professor Ohtsuki thinks the Tokyo circles are caused by small vortices created by passing trains.

Jenny Randles - a respected and sceptical researcher into "anomalous phenomena" - wel-

comed Professor Ohtsuki's findings. "It's a great shame that while we British are still saying 'Is it bovine flatulence or is it aliens from space?' the Japanese are thinking, 'Let's patent it and make a few billion yen'" she said.

The editor of *The Crop Watcher*, Paul Fuller, said at the conference that up to 50 per cent of British crop circles were hoaxes. Eager to extend Professor Ohtsuki's investigations, he said: "We're hoping we can go to London and look through the Underground system. Presumably we'll start at the Circle Line."

Space invader shocks UFO folk, page 2

Greenpeace is a charity entirely by the gift of £12 Single

I enclose cheque


Please charge Access/Visa

Signature: _____

Name: Mr/Mrs/Ms _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____



CENTRE FOR CROP CIRCLE STUDIES


Patron: The Earl of [REDACTED]

From:-
[REDACTED]
Hon. Secretary, CCCS,
[REDACTED]

13th August, 1991

Your reference: D/Sec(AS)12/3

[REDACTED] Esq.,
Secretariat (Air Staff)2a,
Room [REDACTED]
Ministry of Defence,
Whitehall,
London SW1A 2HB



Dear Mr. [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letters of 7th and 8th August.

I am sorry that the government is taking no interest in the crop circle phenomenon. I feel that perhaps it should do so. Japanese universities have thought it worth funding a massive research programme in this country, including the provision of much equipment and the maintenance of a team of 19 scientists in Wiltshire for several weeks this summer. The British could be missing a trick...

Be that as it may, the phenomenon appears to be taking an interest in the government! I enclose (for you to keep) an aerial photograph of a recent event which occurred on the Chequers estate.

You may also like to have the enclosed newspaper cutting.

If at some future date government agencies decide to study the phenomenon, CCCS will remain ready to contribute to research.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Guardian 12 August 1991

Corn circles: back to square one

CORN CIRCLES have been cropping up with ever increasing frequency and complexity in recent months (Environment Guardian, August 2). Yet few writers or scientists address such a potentially serious subject seriously, for fear of ridicule.

We are left with the self- or government-appointed debunker who attempts to explain it all away with some pseudo-scientific theory. In this case the man is Doctor Terence Meaden and the theory is called "plasma ring vortices".

This sounded all very plausible so long as corn circles remained circles, but they haven't. Dr Meaden stretched his theory to include a few straight lines in the corn, but he never bargained for the immensely complex pattern that appeared at Barbury Castle,

Wiltshire, on July 17, 1991. From that day on he must have regretted that he had not attempted to debunk the occurrences by claiming they were a hoax perpetrated by students. Anyone but a fanatic must know that such a pattern is the product of intelligent beings. Whether those beings are of the earthly student variety or of extra terrestrial origins is another question altogether. Let us take the subject seriously and above all let us embarrass those few shadowy people in government who do know the origins of corn circles into sharing their information with us instead of protecting us from it. We might be able to cope with it more responsibly than they. That would not be too difficult.
(Sir) John Whitmore
Leigh n. Tonbridge,
Kent

Corn circles: back to square one


CORN CIRCLES have been cropping up with ever increasing frequency and complexity in recent months. Environment Secretary Alistair 32. Yet few writers or scientists address such a potentially serious subject seriously, for fear of ridicule.

We are left with the work of government appointed ideologue, who attempts to explain it all away with some pseudo-scientific theory. In this case the man is Doctor Terence Meaden and the theory is called 'oleomathic vortex'.

In this case, of all very plausible theories, only one corn circle remained circles, but they haven't. Meaden suggests his theory to include a few straight lines in the corn, but he never returned for the immensely complex pattern that appeared at Barbury Castle

Wiltshire on July 17, 1991. From that day on he must have regretted that he had not attempted to debunk other corn circles by claiming they were a hoax perpetrated by students. Anyone, but a fanatic, must know that such a pattern is the product of intelligent beings. Whether those beings are of the earthly, extraterrestrial or of extra-terrestrial origin is another question altogether. Let us take the subject seriously and above all let us embarrass those few shadowy people in government who do not know the value of openness and sharing their information with us instead of protecting us from it. We might be able to do one with it more responsibly than they. That would not be too difficult.

(Sir) John Whitmore
St John's College,
Cambridge, Kent



CENTRE FOR CROP CIRCLE STUDIES

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Patron: The Earl of [REDACTED]

From: -

[REDACTED]
Hon. Secretary, CACS,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

6th August, 1991

Your Ref: D/Sec(AS)12/3 of 26/7/91

[REDACTED] Esq.,
Secretariat (Air Staff) 2a,
Ministry of Defence

Dear Mr. [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter of 26th July.

Perhaps I might add to my letter of 15th July that a recent crop circle occurrence near Spaldwick, Cambridgeshire, which we think can be dated to the night of 27/28 July, seems to have been of close interest to a Nimrod aircraft (possibly of No. 51 Squadron), which made five low passes across it shortly after sunset on Monday 29th July. We have other anecdotal evidence of what seems to be more than casual interest in these events by military aircraft.

I am, again, writing not to complain but to express the readiness of CACS to contribute to any government research which is being undertaken. Our own aerial surveys of these events, coupled with our field research, indicate some strongly energetic local effects of an unusual kind both before and after crop formations have occurred.

We believe these events are of importance. We would welcome (with suitable discretion) your confirmation that government research is in train. I repeat CACS's offer to contribute to serious study of the phenomenon.

Yours sincerely, -

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct Dialling) [redacted]
(Switchboard) [redacted]
(Fax) [redacted]

Mr [redacted]
Hon. Secretary
Centre for Crop Circle Studies

Your reference

Our reference
D/Sec(AS)12/3

Date
7 August 1991

Dear Mr [redacted]

My predecessor wrote to you on 26 July, with an interim reply to your letter of 15 July 1991 to the Under-Secretary of State for the Armed Forces. I am now able to provide the substantive reply that you were promised.

I should state at the outset that the Ministry of Defence has no interest in crop circles, and is conducting no research or investigations into this phenomenon. You mentioned the involvement of the Army Air Corps, and Lt Col Edgcombe. Clearly, there have been instances of individuals taking photographs of crop circles, but this has only occurred during routine training flights. Individuals are entirely free to pursue their personal interests either in their own time, or in a manner that is consistent with Service regulations. There can be no question of MOD resources being used to support investigation of the crop circle phenomenon.

You also mentioned that a Chinook helicopter was in the Beckhampton-Marlborough area on the night of July 11. I can confirm that a Chinook was in the area at the time, but can assure you that it was conducting a standard training sortie. Its presence in the area was unconnected with crop circles, and there is no question of our having any theory about the formation of crop circles, or indeed any pool of information on the phenomenon.

I hope this is helpful, although I realise it is not the response that you were hoping for. I should like to take this opportunity to wish you and the Centre for Crop Circle Studies luck with your investigations.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted signature]

From: [redacted] secretariat (Air Staff)2a, Room [redacted]

LOOSE MINUTE

D/Sec(NS)513/1

2 August 1991

Sec(AS)2a

Copy to:
GS Sec 1d

ARMY INVOLVEMENT IN CORN CIRCLE INVESTIGATIONS

Reference:

- A. D/GS Sec 41/2 dated 30 July 1991
- B. D/Sec(AS)12/3 dated 1 August 1991

1. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the debate on service involvement in corn circle investigations.
2. I am unaware of any instances in which the RN has helped investigators by taking aerial photographs of these circles and I very much doubt whether any such requests have been received. However, I feel that I would have some difficulty persuading the Navy that they should not co-operate where possible on the basis of the advice contained in reference B.
3. Are we not being over-sensitive towards the UFO lobby here? While our long standing policy of not devoting time or resources to investigating UFO reports is without question sensible, there is surely a need to draw a distinction between bizarre and unconfirmable reports of incidents which probably never occurred and a mildly interesting natural phenomenon the existence of which is patently obvious. It seems odd that we should impose an artificial constraint on servicemen to avoid any association with crop circles simply because of the antics of the lunatic fringe. After all, as your guidelines stipulate, there is no harm in providing assistance where this does not involve the expenditure of extra time or effort. I am quite happy to see RN helicopters overflying these objects should they be asked to do so and intend to register no objection should any requests come my way.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Sec(NS)b
[REDACTED]

LOOSE MINUTE

D/Sec(AS)12/3

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

1 August 1991

GS Sec 1d - [REDACTED]

Copy to:
Sec(NS)b

ARMY INVOLVEMENT IN CORN CIRCLE INVESTIGATIONS

Reference: D/GS Sec 41/2 dated 30 July 1991

1. Thank you for your minute at Reference in which you set out the position with regard to Army involvement into the investigation of corn circles.
2. The fact that photographs have been taken from Army Air Corps helicopters puts us in a difficult position, even if this was done during routine training flights. The MOD's position with regard to UFOs is that we do not devote time or resources to investigation of such reports, unless an incident has any defence significance. For the AAC to involve themselves in this way erodes this position, as the UFO lobby will see this as active investigation of UFO-related activity (as they view corn circles) - something that we have categorically and publicly stated that we do not do.
3. I would be grateful if you would have a look at this, and give some thought to whether it would be possible to steer the AAC away from getting involved with the investigation of corn circles.
4. Of course, none of this would in any way prevent AAC personnel getting involved in their own time, provided that Service/MOD resources were not used.
5. I would be grateful for your rapid advice, as I believe we should ensure that our policy is consistent before we reply to the letter from the Centre for Crop Circle Studies.
6. I am copying this minute to Sec(NS), who may wish to ensure that Naval helicopters are not similarly involved.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Sec(AS)2a
[REDACTED]

LOOSE MINUTE

D/GS Sec 41/2

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

2 August 1991

Sec(AS)2a

Copy to:
Sec(NS)b
SO2 Coord ACC Centre (with attachment)

ARMY INVOLVEMENT IN CORN CIRCLES INVESTIGATION


1. Thank you for your minute Sec(AS)12/3 of 1 August.
2. Frankly I am reluctant to start firing off edicts about what AAC pilots can and can't do when they spot corn circles beneath their helicopters - I am pretty sure that I wouldn't be taken seriously if I did.
3. I think it is already generally accepted that MOD resources must not be used specifically in pursuit of personal interests. I do not, however, see that the act of taking photographs of corn circles during routine training flights - which incidentally frequently entail maintaining a low hover in a chosen position - consumes any additional resources whatsoever. Neither do I see any difficulty in such photographs being made available to organisations concerned with solving the mystery, provided no impression was given that they formed any part of an official MOD investigations.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

GS Sec 1d

[REDACTED]



LOOSE MINUTE

D/GS Sec 41/2

30 July 1991

Sec(AS)2a - Mr [REDACTED]

Copy to:


Hels 2

PL(LS)L1

AG Sec 1c

S10f(Air)

AAC Centre - SO2 Coord



ARMY INVOLVEMENT IN CORN CIRCLE INVESTIGATIONS

References: A. D/GS Sec 41/2 dated 18 July
B. D/Sec(AS) 12/3 dated 17 July

1. Further to Reference A, I attach a short piece provided by the Army Air Corps on the involvement of LT Col (Retd) [REDACTED] AFC in the corn circles business.

2. You will note that Lt Col [REDACTED] interest was entirely personal and was originally sparked by a routine low flying complaint from a local farmer. Though a report of was made to MOD I suspect that this was solely on Lt Col [REDACTED] own initiative.

3. I have not attempted to verify the claim that a pilot from 658 Sqn took pictures of corn circles - I am sure we can take Mr [REDACTED] word for it. I imagine that this is just another example of an AAC pilot taking a personal interest in the phenomenon.

4. I agree with your suggested line of reply (Reference B, paragraph 4), but you might consider developing it along the following lines.

MOD has no interest in the corn circles phenomenon and therefore has nothing to offer in the way of information exchange. However, as they have done in the past, individuals in the Services are free to pursue their personal interests either in their own time or in a manner that is consistent with normal training objectives. If, for example, Army Air Corps pilots take photographs of corn circles during routine training flights they would be entirely free to share the results with organisations concerned with solving the mystery. Nor would MOD object to such organisations cultivating their existing individual contacts with the Services, provide it was understood that no MOD resources could be made available for the sole purpose of corn circle research.

5. I hope this helps, and I would be grateful for a copy of your reply.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

GS Sec 1d

[REDACTED]

CIRCLES IN THE CORN
INVOLVMENT OF LT COL (RETD) [REDACTED] AFC

In 1985 Lt Col [REDACTED] then SO1 STANDARDS/NIGHT SAFETY HQ DAAC, was contacted by a local farmer asking what the AAC had been doing to his corn. Taking the Technical Accident Investigation Officer (AIFSO) with him he visited the area which was about 2 miles from Middle Wallop. It turned out to be a perfect set of circles in the corn.

Neither he nor the AIFSO could find any sensible explanation for the rings accept to state categorically that it was nothing to do with helicopters. Col [REDACTED] submitted a factual report to MOD, accompanied by good photographs, stating what they saw and their inability to explain it.

A local man, Mr Colin Andrews (author of Circles in the Corn) a member of a group who had been investigating the circles for some years, also turned up on the scene. He invited Col [REDACTED] to attend a meeting at which any theories could be put forward for the meeting to shoot down. Col [REDACTED] was asked to attend as a helicopter agent to debate the inevitable "It's HELICOPTERS" theories. This he did and found the meeting to be very sensible and level headed. He told the chairman the gist of his report.

Col [REDACTED] became intrigued and that year, 1985, passed the word round to UK based AAC units to let him know if they saw any circles and give him the Grid Ref. There were one or two responses and then interest waiwed.

Col [REDACTED] was subsequently approached by BBC TV Pebble Mill, who were making a film about the circles, to again be the helicopter agent and debate the helicopter theories. This he did, and laid on a demonstration with a helicopter in long grass to conclusively illustrate the facts. This was all filmed and shown on TV. Lt Col [REDACTED] continues to take an inactive interest in the circles and would be delighted to be given a satisfactory explanation for them.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Hels 2 } - hels involvement ?
} *offic*

E991

[REDACTED]

LOOSE MINUTE

D/S10(Air)/41/17/1

26 July 91

Sec(AS)2a
GS Sec 1d
Hels 2
PL(LS)L1
AG Sec 1c

Copy to :

Company Secretary - Defence Research Agency

ARMY INVOLVEMENT IN CROP CIRCLE INVESTIGATIONS

Reference: D/Sec(AS)/12/3 dated 17 July 91

1. Thank you for the chance to comment on the above. I can confirm your supposition, in para 5 of the reference, that there are no restrictions on the activities of RAF personnel in their leisure time. Personnel would of course have to obey any Standing Orders and take account of general security requirements.

Involve ment with the Centre for Crop Circle Investigat
would be governed by the provisions of QR(RAF) Chap 36 Section
which is common to all three Services. May I suggest that you
copy the correspondence to DPR(RAF) and DPO(RAF).

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
S10f1(Air)
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

LOOSE MINUTE

D/PL(LS) 630/3

24^d July 1991

Sec(AS)2a = Mr [REDACTED]

Copy to:
GS Sec1d
Hels 2
AG Sec1c
S10f(Air)

ARMY INVOLVEMENT IN CORN CIRCLE INVESTIGATIONS

Reference: D/Sec(AS) 12/3 - 17/7/91.

1. Thank you for the reference seeking comments on the above subject.
2. I have nothing to add to that in your paragraphs 4 and 5. I trust this is of help.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
PL(LS)L3
[REDACTED]



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct Dialling) [REDACTED]
(Switchboard)
(Fax) [REDACTED]

94
+2

Mr [REDACTED]
Hon. Secretary
Centre for Crop Circle Studies
[REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference D/Sec(AS)12/3 [initials]

Date 26 July 1991

Dear Mr [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter of 15 July 1991 to the Under-Secretary of State for the Armed Forces on the subject of Crop Circle studies which has been passed to me for reply.

I regret that I am unable to answer your queries at present, but hope to provide a substantive reply in the near future.

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] Secretariat (Air Staff)2a, Room [REDACTED]



E911

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

LOOSE MINUTE

D/GS Sec 41/2

18 July 1991

12/3

Sec(AS)2a - Mr [REDACTED]

Copy to:
Hels 2
PL(LS)L1
AG Sec 1c
S10f(Air)

ARMY INVOLVEMENT IN CORN CIRCLE INVESTIGATIONS

1. Thank you for your minute 12/3 of 17 July.
2. My previous advice to your office on this subject was not, as you suggest, categorical on the subject of Army involvement. Rather it was my opinion that it was not worth going to the trouble of trying to ascertain the facts. That said I have asked Middle Wallop to see if they can find out anything about Lt Col Edgcombe and his alleged 1985 report to the MOD. I am not, however, optimistic of receiving a reply before your deadline of 26 July (nor, indeed, of Middle Wallop's chances of turning anything up at all) and you may therefore consider sending a holding reply.

f [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
GS Sec 1d
[REDACTED]

Phone call from AG Sec 1c - No probs with MOD civies or servicemen participating in corn circle research.

LOOSE MINUTE

L. Sec(AS)12/3 ←

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

17 July 1991

GS Sec 1d
Hels 2
PL(LS)L1
AG Sec 1c
S10f(Air)(Glos)

Copy to:

Company Secretary - Defence Research Agency

ARMY INVOLVEMENT IN CORN CIRCLE INVESTIGATIONS

References: A) Letter from Centre for Crop Circle Studies dated 15 July 1991
B) D/GS Sec 41/2 dated 16 October 1991

1. I attach a copy of Reference A, which has been passed onto Sec(AS) by US of S (AF)'s office for answer.
2. I would be grateful if GS Sec could provide advice on the first paragraph of the second page of Mr [REDACTED] letter, especially regarding the claims of Army co-operation with crop circle researchers, the use of Army helicopters to photograph the phenomena and Lt Col [REDACTED] report to MoD. You will recall your earlier advice at Reference B in response to a letter by a [REDACTED] which refuted his claim that the Army was assisting with crop circle investigations.
3. Could Hels 2 provide advice regarding Mr [REDACTED] report of a Chinook in the Beckhampton - Marlborough area from 23.30 hours on the night of 11 July ?
4. I intend to answer Mr [REDACTED] in the terms we normally use for UFO correspondents - saying that the MoD has no official interest in corn circles, and that we could not justify the use of Defence funds on scientific (or other) investigations, unless a clear threat to the security of the UK had been identified.
5. However, I do not wish to give the impression that MoD is in any way 'covering up' anything, and for that reason I would like to add that there is no reason why MoD or Service personnel should not become involved in corn circle research in their spare time as long as MoD resources were not used in this activity. PL(LS)L1, AG Sec 1c and S10f(Air) may wish to comment on this line.
6. US of S(AF)'s office have asked that a reply be sent to Mr [REDACTED] by 30 July and could I therefore have your inputs by 26 July, please ?

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Sec(AS)2a
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Sec. (AS) 17

17 JUL 1991

FILE 12/3

OUR REF: ADG/OA/100/ 3914


..... Sec (AS)

The attached letter from .. [REDACTED] .. ES9/.....
..... is forwarded to you for official action.

This letter has ~~has~~ not been acknowledged from this office. The Minister attaches great importance in prompt replies to correspondence he receives and would like this letter answered by COP 30/7/91, or alternatively, if a delay is anticipated, an interim reply should be forwarded, preferably within the same timescale.

Would you please let us see a copy of your reply quoting our reference. If this correspondence is transferred, then this office must be notified.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
AO/US of S(AF)
[REDACTED]



CENTRE FOR CROP CIRCLE STUDIES

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

SEC 1A3,1

Patron: The Earl of [REDACTED]

From:-

[REDACTED]
Hon. Secretary, CCCS,
[REDACTED]

15th July, 1991

The Under-Secretary of State,
The Army Department,
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Dear Sir,

I am writing on behalf of the Centre for Crop Circle Studies (CCCS) to enquire whether we can be of any assistance to your own studies of the interesting phenomenon of the unexplained disturbances which have been appearing in fields of crops in recent years, particularly in the south west of the country.

The presence of an Army Chinook helicopter in the area of Beckhampton-Marlborough, Wiltshire, for a substantial period from about 23.30 hours last Thursday, 11th July, flying at very low level and on at least one occasion using its searchlight, indicates that you may have a hypothesis about the causation of the crop circle events to which we could usefully contribute from our own studies.

You may by now have received complaints from local residents about this prolonged intrusion at a late hour. My own purpose in writing is not, however, to make a complaint but to register CCCS's interest.

The Centre was founded early in 1990 to conduct systematic research into the puzzling sequence of events which, as you will know, first came under scientific study by [REDACTED] in 1980. Several of us have felt that [REDACTED] attempts (with the recent assistance of Japanese scientists) to formulate the model of an unusual atmospheric vortex which might account for the crop circle formations have failed to produce more than, at best, a partial answer. CCCS's explicit aim is to broaden the scope of research. Following the establishment of several research panels last autumn, we are making a degree of progress. We would like nothing better than to pool our information with any data which is being collected by government organisations.

We are currently in cordial (though discreet) relations with the local police in Wiltshire, whose own aerial surveys of the crop circle events are adding to our knowledge. It might be of value both to us, as a learned society, and to you, as a Department with public responsibilities, if we could exchange information with you on some mutually agreeable basis.

There is a precedent for this kind of collaboration. In August 1987 a pilot of No. 658 Squadron, Army Air Corps, Netheravon, took some excellent aerial photographs of crop circles near Westbury, Wiltshire. Thanks to the courtesy of the Army Air Corps, these were made available to a research organisation which preceeded CCCS and have since been published. The same organisation and other civilian researchers had held a useful conference at Alresford, Hampshire, in October 1985, which was attended by Lt.Col. [REDACTED] of Middle Wallop. A report made to the MOD by Lt.Col. [REDACTED] was very helpfully placed on the public record and has also since been published.

These early steps towards an exchange of information do not, unfortunately, seem to have been followed up by the organisation concerned. CCCS believes that it might be fruitful to resume them, particularly at local level, and particularly in Wiltshire, where many events are currently occurring.

I and other members of my Council are at the Department's disposal if a discussion seems useful to you.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Section 40

From:

Section 40

Sent:

18 November 2007 13:39

To:

Section 40

Subject:

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 12-11-2007-091644-016

Dear Section 40

Further to your response to my query:

a) I am fully aware that the MOD does not hold a file on "Crop Circles", you have made that perfectly clear.

b) However, I am given to understand that MOD does hold some material on crop circles, but that it is held within another series of files relating to UFOs and UFO correspondence, dating from the period 1991-1995, possibly in the file series D/Sec(AS)12/3?

c) I am also given to understand that, in response to an FOI request from another member of the public during 2005 or 2006, that you or a member of your staff were able to provide that requestor with copies of the material referred to in (b), from this series of files?

d) Could you confirm that is indeed the case, or not.

If the answer is yes - then:


e) I wish to make a request for a copy of the material supplied to the other requestor.

Under the FOIA act, Section 16, you are required to provide assist to requestors - it would seem to me that I have made it perfectly clear what material I am looking for. OK, the file reference I supplied D/Sec(AS) 12/6 was in error, but it should be abundantly clear that I am simply requesting a copy of the material on crop circles released earlier this year to another member of the public. A request that either you or another member of your staff must have dealt with, and therefore I would expect you to be aware of that fact.

As far as I am aware there is nothing in the Act to prevent someone making a request for a copy of the response sent to another requestor. A glance at your 'Disclosure Log' makes it clear that many other people have made similar requests for copies of responses sent to other members of the public. On that basis, I cannot understand why this request has become the source of such a convoluted exchanges.

Regards

Section 40



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 07-11-2007-155411-001 Expiry: 6 Dec 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

9 questions asking for arrangements surrounding transfer of UFO files to National Archive

Case for release of information

There is no need to withhold this information.

Names of individuals appearing in the file list are withheld under s.40

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to release the aforementioned information

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date: 5/12/07

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 05 December 2007 11:53
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 07-11-2007-155411-001
Attachments: R - FILES FOR RELEASE.pdf

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of information request of 7 November 2007 which raised a number of questions regarding the administration of the release of the DIS and DAS UFO files. I will deal with them in order.

Q1. What is the redaction policy for documents released as a result of this initiative. Will public and/or official names be withheld?

Documents released under the upcoming programme will be released in accordance with existing Freedom of Information principles and guidelines.

Q2. Will they be available in paper or digital form at the National Archive?

It is the intention to make both the DAS and DIS files available in digital format through TNA "Doc-Online" service. However, as the DAS original files were created in paper, these files will be transferred to TNA and made available to the public in that format in due course. The original DIS paper files were contaminated by asbestos and have been destroyed in accordance with health and safety requirements now that they have been reconstituted in electronic format. However, a paper version will be made available to the public in TNA shortly after the transfer of the electronic file.

Q3. Have the TNA agreed to collect these documents as they released?

TNA will accept the transfer of these records as they are released by MOD. However, there is an internal process that the records have to undergo at TNA before they can be made available to the general public. It is not envisaged that there will be any significant delays in placing the redacted electronic files on Docs Online.

Q4. If the documents are redacted, will the unredacted versions be available as per current arrangements i.e. under the 30 year rule?

At this early stage in the project, almost all redactions made are under FOIA s.40 (i.e. names of officials and names/addressees of those reporting UFO sighting), and as such will remain closed for the usual period of 30 years. However, there may be some instances where other sensitivities are found to exist, so it is not possible at this time to declare with absolute certainty that all redactions will be available after 30 years.

Q5. If FOI requests are to be included do you mean the original request, the responses or both?

It is intended that both the original request and answer will be released. Names and addresses of requesters will be withheld.

Q6. What will be the most recent dates on released material under this initiative?

05/12/2007

Material released over the coming years will include documents up to and including 2007.

Q7. Can you please provide a list of files it is intended to release?

I attach a list of those closed files the MoD will be releasing. You will note that the titles of a number of files have been partially redacted. This is because the titles contain the names of correspondents which are being withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Files A-W on series D/DAS/10/2/8/13 are entitled "Information Management - Defence Information Management - The Freedom of Information Act - Requests for Information". However, for reasons of space, I have shortened the titles on the attached spreadsheet to "FOI Requests".

Q8. Will this planned release affect FOI requests for material which is intended for release?

All FOI requests will be considered on an individual basis, but the MoD will apply exemption s.22 (Information intended for Future Publication) if it deems it appropriate. As I am sure you will appreciate, the more time that is spent answering individual FOI requests, the longer the release programme will take.

Q9. Which files are intended for release in the first tranche and is there a provisional date for that release.

Currently a range of files are being reviewed and prepared for release. Until these administrative procedures have been completed and the Lord Chancellor's Advisory Council has approved the necessary Lord Chancellor's Instruments it is not possible to advise you which files will be released in the first tranche or to set a provisional date for their release.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI
05-H-**Section 40**
MoD Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

05/12/2007

DAS FILES FOR RELEASE**Prefix File Number Part Title**

D/DS8/	10/209/1	C	General Briefs & Reports, UFO Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/1	A	Unidentified Flying Objects - Policy
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	B	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	C	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	D	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	E	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	F	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	G	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	H	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	I	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	J	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	K	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	L	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	M	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	N	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2	O	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) Reports
D/Sec(AS)	12/2/1	A	UFOs Report of Sighting Rendlesham Forest December 1981
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	A	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	B	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	C	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	D	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	E	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	F	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	G	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	H	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	I	Unidentified Flying Objects - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	J	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	K	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	L	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	M	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	N	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	O	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	P	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	Q	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/3	R	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Correspondence
D/Sec(AS)	12/4	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Parliamentary Questions & Enquiries
D/Sec(AS)	12/4	B	UFOS - Parliamentary Questions & Enquiries
D/Sec(AS)	12/5	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Close Encounters, Alien Entities, Abductions
D/Sec(AS)	12/6	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Alleged UFO Incident Crash of Lightning F6 8 Sep 70
D/Sec(AS)	12/7	A	Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOS) - Incident 31 March 1993
D/DAS (Sec)	64/1	A	UFOS - Policy
D/DAS (Sec)	64/1	B	UFOS - Policy
D/DAS (Sec)	64/1	C	UFOS - Policy
D/DAS (Sec)	64/1	D	UFOS - Policy

D/Sec(AS) 64/2	H	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	I	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/2	J	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS 64/2	K	Unidentified Flying Objects Sighting reports
(Sec)		
D/DAS 64/2	L	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
(Sec)		
D/DAS 64/2	M	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
(Sec)		
D/DAS/ 64/2	N	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	O	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	P	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	Q	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	R	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	S	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	T	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/DAS/ 64/2	U	UFOs – UFO Sighting Reports
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	A	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	B	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	C	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	D	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	E	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	F	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	G	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	H	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	I	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	J	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	K	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	L	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	M	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	N	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	O	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	P	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	Q	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	R	UFOs – Public Correspondence
D/Sec(AS) 64/3	S	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	T	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	U	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	V	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	W	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	X	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	Y	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	Z	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	AA	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	AB	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	AC	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/DAS/ 64/3	AD	UFOs – Public Correspondence & Requests for Information
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/1	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/1	B	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/2	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/3	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/4	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/5	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/6	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS) 64/3/7	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX

D/DAS/	64/3/12	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/DAS/	64/3/13	A	UFOs - Public Correspondence - Persistent Correspondent XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS)	64/3/14	A	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS)	64/3/15	A	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS)	64/3/15	B	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS)	64/3/16	A	UFOs - Persistent Correspondent - XXXXXXXXXXXX
D/Sec(AS)	64/4	A	UFOs - Parliamentary Questions & Enquiries
D/Sec(AS)	64/4	B	UFOs - Parliamentary Questions & Enquiries
D/Sec(AS)	64/4	C	UFOs - PQs/Pes
D/Sec(AS)	64/4	D	UFOs - PQs/Pes
D/Sec(AS)	64/4	E	UFOs - PQs/Pes
D/Sec(AS)	64/4	F	UFOs - PQs/Pes
D/DAS	64/4	G	UFOs - PQs/Pes
(Sec)			
D/Sec(AS)	64/5	A	UFOs - Press Cuttings
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	A	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	B	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	C	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	D	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	E	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	F	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	G	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	H	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	I	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	J	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	K	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	L	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	M	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	N	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	O	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	P	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	Q	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	R	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	S	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	T	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	U	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	V	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	W	FOI Requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	X	Freedom of Information - Requests for Information
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	Y	FOI Requests for Information requests
D/DAS/	10/2/8/13	Z	FOI Requests for Information requests

**DIS FILES FOR
RELEASE**

D/DI55/	108/15/1/32		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/34		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/35		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/36	A	UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/36	B	UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/37		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/38		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/39		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/40		UFO - Incidents

D/DI55/	108/15/1/49		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/50		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/51		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/52		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/53		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15/1/54		UFO - Incidents
D/DI55/	108/15	4	UFO - Policy
D/DI55/	108/15	5	UFO - Policy
D/DI55/	108/15	6	UFO - Policy

Section 40

07-11-2007-155411-001

From: Section 40
Sent: 07 November 2007 14:37
To: Section 40
Subject: FoIA request

EXP 5 DEC 07

Hello Section 40

This is supplementary to request 08-10-2007-090830-001. While some of the questions may be answered in the outstanding part of that request, at this juncture that is not known, nor do I know if the outstanding part will be allowed.

1. What is the redaction policy for documents released as a result of this initiative? Will public and/or official's names and contact details be withheld?
2. Will they be available in paper or digital form at TNA?
3. Has TNA already agreed to collect these records as they are released? (There have been instances of significant delay when the MoD have prepared records for release, but TNA have not been ready to accept them).
4. If the released records are redacted, will the unredacted versions be available as per current arrangements (ie usually after 30 years of the date of the most recent enclosure)?
5. In your response to request 08-10-2007-090830-001, you wrote "...will also include Freedom of Information requests received since 2005 relating to UFOs". Please can you clarify if you mean the original requests, the responses to those requests, or both.
6. What will be the most recent dates on the released material under this initiative?
7. Please can you provide a list of the files it is intended to release.
8. Will this planned release affect FoIA requests for material which is intended to be released (will the requester be told that they will have to wait for the scheduled release, even if the release date can't be specified and may be up to 3 years away)?
9. Which files will be included in the first tranche of the release, and is there a provisional date for that release?

Regards,

Section 40

Section 40

50

From: Section 40

Sent: 04 December 2007 11:15

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 23-11-2007-093452-002

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 22 November 2007 asking for details of the scrambling of two fighter jets to investigate an alleged UFO incident at Felpham in West Sussex on 4 October 2007. You also asked for copies of any pictures or reports of the alleged unknown objects taken by the pilots or the MoD.

No aircraft were scrambled to investigate this matter. The alleged sighting has not been reported to this office which acts as the focal point for UFO reports across the MoD. We are therefore unaware of any reports or photographs of the alleged incident.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

04/12/2007

Section 40

23-11-2007-093452-002

From:

Section 40

EXP 2. DEC 07

Sent: 22 November 2007 23:54

To:

Section 40

Cc:

Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 16-10-2007-105758-002

Section 40

If you want to mince words and play with the definition of 'recent' to satisfy the frankly absurd requirements that none of this information can be released, I will provide you with a request for a very recent event. Please, if you will, release the full details on the scrambling of fighter jets to intercept the unknown objects described in the following news article from today, as well as any pictures or reports of the unknown objects taken by the fighter pilots or MoD.

<http://www.worthingherald.co.uk/6427/UFO-report--RAF-did.3488813.jp>

UFO report – RAF did send fighters up

A UFO spotter from Felpham has appealed to anyone else who saw the objects to contact him. Leo Lindsay and his wife, Rosie, watched the visitors from outer space from a bedroom window.

Mr Lindsay has since had unofficial confirmation from the Ministry of Defence that two RAF planes were sent up to investigate the phenomenon.

"The RAF don't do that unless there is a real reason," he stated. "I can't believe no one else saw the objects. I would estimate they were each about the size of a house.

"Anyone walking along Felpham seafront at that time would not have been able to miss them. I hope they will let me know on 01243 855728."

Mr Lindsay estimates the objects must have been above Felpham seafront in a beautiful light blue sky with white puffy clouds. He was looking out of a bedroom window in his home in Roundle Avenue at about 6pm on October 4 when he saw 'two round football-shaped objects' coming over the trees high in the sky.

He went downstairs to tell his wife. He watched as the objects changed to become 'multi-faceted diamond shaped discs which moved further apart'.

The fighter planes appeared on the scene ten minutes later. Two aunts staying with the couple also saw the incident.

Last Updated: 15 November 2007 10:16 AM

Section 40

On Nov 13, 2007, at 1:45 AM, Section 40 wrote:

23/11/2007

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your e-mail of 21 October 2007 which requested I revisit my previous response to you of 16 October 2007.

Your Freedom of Information request of 15 October 2007 asked whether there had been any air space violation incidents involving unknown objects in *recent years*. The incident you refer to, details of which have already been made available to the public by this branch on the MoD website, took place some 14 years ago. Since it took place so long ago and has already been the subject of considerable speculation and debate amongst ufologists, I did not consider it in my response to you. However, if you can specify which time period you are interested in, I will look at your request again.

If you are still dissatisfied, then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 04 December 2007 10:10

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 27-11-2007-154550-006 AND TO07013/2007

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail to Des Browne, the Secretary of State for Defence, regarding the scrambling of RAF jets to investigate an alleged UFO sighting near Bognor on 4th October 2007. It has been passed to this branch to answer as we have responsibility for this subject. Additionally, you raised a Freedom of Information request on the same topic. I shall both queries in the same e-mail.

Firstly, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

Turning to your actual question, I can confirm that no aircraft were launched to investigate this matter.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building
Whitehall
London

04/12/2007

SW1A 2HB

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 27 November 2007 15:42

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: foi email request 27-11-2007-154550-006 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 at 15:42:09

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtoccupation: Radio and TV Presenter

txtorganisation: Glastonbury Broadcasting Ltd

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txttelephone: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: Could you please confirm that two RAF jets were scrambled to confront an alleged UFO over Bognor on October 4th?

Section 40

Glastonbury Radio

Section 40

From: Section 40 Wg Cdr
Sent: 03 December 2007 16:08
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: Release-Authorised: foi email request 27-11-2007-154550-006 Section 40
Categories: FOI

Section 40

You may wish to see the response provided below to a very similar request

Section 40

Wg Cdr
 SO1 Air & Ops Dev
 CT & UK Ops
 MOD Main Building
 Floor 4 Zone I

Section 40

CTandUKOps-SO1 Air & Ops Dev (DII)
 Section 40 (DII)

From: Section 40
Sent: 03 December 2007 16:05
To: Section 40 Cdr
Subject: FW: Release-Authorised: foi email request 27-11-2007-154550-006 Section 40

Similar to your FOI request.

Section 40

CT & UK Ops Pol 1b
 MB4-I Section 40

From: Section 40 SQN LDR
Sent: 29 November 2007 13:51
To: Section 40 Sqn Ldr ; Section 40
Cc: Section 40 ; Section 40 Wg Cdr
Subject: RE: Release-Authorised: foi email request 27-11-2007-154550-006 Section 40

The assets committed to the QRA mission remain standard and were so on 4th Oct. There were no live launches of any of these assets on the date in question for unplanned incursions of or perceived threats to the UK or NATO airspace. There was however a training launch of one aircraft from RAF Leuchars in the afternoon of the date in question; the aircraft was tasked to work in the North Sea and was all times under the control of the ASACS community.

Section 40

Sqn Ldr
 SO2 F3 Ops
 HQ 1 Gp

Section 40

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient or there are problems please notify the sender and then delete the e-mail (and file(s) if

03/12/2007

(attached) from your system. Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on MOD systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The MOD has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. However it accepts no liability for any loss or damage howsoever caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks. The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the department.

From: Section 40 Sqn Ldr
Sent: 29 November 2007 12:58
To: Section 40 SQN LDR
Cc:
Subject: RE: Release-Authorised: foi email request 27-11-2007-154550-006 Section 40

Section 40

I have nothing to indicate any launch on 4th Oct. You might wish to try the CAOC as they keep records of all such activity.

Section 40

Can you shed any light?

Section 40

Sqn Ldr
 PSO/AOC 1 Gp
 DSN: Section 40
 BT:

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient or there are problems please notify the sender and then delete the e-mail (and file(s) if attached) from your system. Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on MOD systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The MOD has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. However it accepts no liability for any loss or damage howsoever caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks. The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the department.

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 29 November 2007 12:25
To: Section 40 Sqn Ldr ; Section 40
Subject: FW: Release-Authorised: foi email request 27-11-2007-154550-006

Section 40

Dear both,
 Please see the FOI request below.
 Could you please task this to the relevant person to find out if we hold any info on this?
 I would appreciate a response if possible nlt Thursday 6/12 at 1700

Regards,

Section 40

RAF Business Secretariat
 AIR COMMAND
 RAF High Wycombe
 mil: Section 40
 ext:
 fax:

Email: Section 40

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 29 November 2007 12:12
To: Air CmdSecCS-RAF Parli Business
Subject: Release-Authorised: foi email request 27-11-2007-154550-006 Section 40

03/12/2007

Air,

Can you take?

Section 40

Info-AccessOps5

Section 40

Main Building

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 27 November 2007 15:42

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: foi email request 27-11-2007-154550-006 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 at 15:42:09

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: Section 40

txtoccupation: Radio and TV Presenter

txtorganisation: Glastonbury Broadcasting Ltd


txtemailAddress: Section 40

txttelephone: Section 40

txtinforequest: Could you please confirm that two RAF jets were scrambled to confront an alleged UFO over Bognor on October 4th?

Section 40

Glastonbury Radio



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 04 December 2007 09:42

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 23-11-2007-065-001

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 22 November 2007 asking whether two jets were despatched to investigate an alleged UFO incident at Felpham in West Sussex on 4 October 2007. You also asked what the aircraft saw, what the pilots reported and where the aircraft were launched from and whether there were any radar contacts.

The MoD has no record of any aircraft being launched to investigate this matter, or of any radar contacts.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

04/12/2007

EXP 21 DEC 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 22 November 2007 12:21

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request PS 23-11-2007-065152-001 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Thursday, November 22, 2007 at 12:20:39

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2: **Section 40**

txttowncity: Dewsbury

txtstatecountry: West Yorkshire

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: I read with interest a report in the online edition of the Worthing Herald (<http://www.worthingherald.co.uk/6427/UFO-report--RAF-did.3488813.jp>) about the sighting of a pair of unknown objects in the sky above Felpham, West Sussex, on 4 october, 2007 at about 6pm. The news report stated that two fighter jets appeared on the scene and the article goes on to say that there was "had unofficial confirmation from the Ministry of Defence that two RAF planes were sent up to investigate the phenomenon."

Could you confirm that two jets were despatched to investigate the objects in question and what they found when they arrived on the scene? Where were these jets launched from? What did the pilots report? Were there any radar contacts?

Thank you for your indulgence,

Section 40



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 28-11-2007-150422-004 Expiry: 18 Dec 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Copies of UAP Report and executive summary.

Copy of all documentation held on UFOs

Case for release of information

UAP Reports already on website

Other UFO information to be withheld as likely to exceed £600 cost

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information

Grade/Rank: B1 Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05.....

Date: 30/11/07



From: **Section 40**
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40
Press Office
Dreiwerdner Weg 77 C
09648 Mittweida
Germany

Our Reference
28-11-2007-150422-004
Date
30 November 2007

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 20 November 2007 asking for copies of the "UAP in the UK Air Defence Region: Executive Summary" and "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP) in the UK Air Defence Region – Results of Internal Review". Additionally, you asked for all information relating to UFOs or UAPs and a list of all documents concerning UFOs and UAPs.

Both the documents you mention are available for viewing on the MoD website www.mod.uk by searching in the publication scheme under the word UAP.

The MoD files on this subject go back to the late 1970s. Copies of UFO correspondence and reports are filed in the order in which they are received. Before any of this information can be released, personal data has to be removed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. If we were to search for and then process copies of all the documentation held, the costs would quickly exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and, as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request. I should also add that the MoD does not have a list of all its documents relating to UFOs. Any attempt to list all documents held by the MoD on this subject would be a major task and once again exceed the £600 limit.

That having been said, there are some 160 files held by two branches, DAS and DI55, that deal with the subject of UFOs dating from the late 1970s to 2007 and it has been decided to place them in the National Archive over the next three years, commencing, it is hoped, in Spring 2008. The release will be undertaken on a rolling programme in chronological order, starting with the oldest files first and will also include Freedom of Information requests received since 2005 relating to UFOs.

Details of UFO sighting reports for the years 1998 to 2006, are held on the Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website. This can be accessed via the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomofInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports. I suspect that this will give you much of the information you are looking for. Details of sightings for 2007 will be placed on the website early in 2008.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely

destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

As I speak no German, I have attached an automated translation. Please accept my apologies for any grammatical errors.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40



Vielen Dank für Ihre "Freedom of Information Anfrage vom 20. November 2007 um Kopien der" UAP in der britischen Air Defence Region: Executive Summary "und" Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP) in der britischen Air Defence Region - Ergebnisse der internen Review ". Zusätzlich können Sie aufgefordert, alle Informationen über UFOs oder UAPs und eine Liste aller Dokumente über UFOs und UAPs.

Beide Dokumente, die Sie erwähnen, sind für die Anzeige auf dem Verteidigungsministerium Website www.mod.uk suchen in der Veröffentlichung unter der UAP Wort.

Das Verteidigungsministerium Dateien zu diesem Thema gehen zurück bis in die späten 1970er Jahre. Kopien von UFO Korrespondenz und Berichte werden in der Reihenfolge, in der sie empfangen werden. Vor jedem dieser Informationen können freigegeben werden, persönliche Daten entfernt werden in Übereinstimmung mit dem Data Protection Act 1998. Wenn wir bei der Suche nach und dann Kopien aller in der Dokumentation statt, die Kosten würden schneller als die erlaubten £ 600 Limit für die Einhaltung der Freedom of Information Act "2000 und, wie in Abschnitt 12 des Gesetzes, das Ministerium für Die Verteidigung ist nicht verpflichtet, sich mit Ihrer Anfrage. Ich möchte auch hinzufügen, dass das Verteidigungsministerium nicht über eine Liste mit allen Dokumenten im Zusammenhang mit UFOs. Jeder Versuch, eine Liste aller Dokumente, die im Besitz des Verteidigungsministeriums zu diesem Thema wäre eine große Aufgabe und noch einmal über die £ 600 begrenzen.

Dass die gesagt wurde, gibt es rund 160 Dateien, die von zwei Filialen, DAS und DI55, die sich mit dem Thema UFOs aus den späten 1970er Jahren bis 2007, und es wurde beschlossen, sie in der National Archiv in den nächsten drei Jahren , Beginnend, so hofft man, im Frühjahr 2008. Die Freigabe wird zu einem fortlaufenden Programms in chronologischer Reihenfolge, beginnend mit dem ältesten Dateien erste und wird auch "Freedom of Information Anfragen, die seit 2005 im Zusammenhang mit UFOs.

Details zu UFO Sichtung Berichte für die Jahre 1998 bis 2006, werden auf das Ministerium für Verteidigung "Freedom of Information Website. Dies kann über das Internet unter: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomofInformation/PublicationScheme>, indem Sie unter "UFO" berichtet. Ich vermute, dass diese Ihnen einen Großteil der Informationen, die Sie suchen. Einzelheiten zu den Museumsdirektor für 2007 wird auf der Website Anfang 2008.

Schließlich können Sie auch wollen sich bewusst sein, dass der MOD hat bereits eine Vielzahl von Informationen über UFOs, die steht für Public Viewing. MOD Dateien wurden routinemäßig zerstört nach 5 Jahren bis 1967, als sie waren in der Regel erhalten für die National Archives. Ein paar haben überlebt, bevor 1967 und diese zusammen mit den Aufzeichnungen bis 1984 sind nun verfügbar für Public Viewing. The National Archives kontaktiert werden kann bei Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey, TW9 4DU oder Telefon 020 8876 3444. Die National Archives haben auch eine Website mit Informationen über die Datensätze, wie sie halten und den Zugang zu ihnen. Diese finden Sie im Internet unter: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

Wenn Sie unzufrieden sind mit dieser Antwort, oder Sie möchten sich über alle Aspekte der Bearbeitung Ihrer Anfrage, dann sollten Sie sich mit mir in der ersten Instanz. Wenn informelle Beilegung nicht möglich ist, und Sie sind immer noch nicht zufrieden, dann können Sie sich für eine unabhängige interne Überprüfung durch die Kontaktaufnahme mit dem Direktor der Information Ausbeutung, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Bitte beachten Sie, dass jeder Antrag auf eine interne Überprüfung muss innerhalb von 40 Werktagen nach dem Tag, an dem der Versuch zu erreichen informellen Resolution ein Ende gefunden hat.

Wenn Sie noch unglücklich nach einer internen Überprüfung, können Sie Ihre Beschwerde an die Information Commissioner im Rahmen der Bestimmungen von Abschnitt 50 des Freedom of Information Act ". Bitte beachten Sie, dass die Informationen nicht untersuchen Kommissar wird der Fall, bis die internen Überprüfung abgeschlossen ist. Weitere Einzelheiten über die Rolle und die Befugnisse des Kommissars Informationen finden Sie auf der Website des Kommissars, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>. "

Wie spreche ich kein Deutsch, ich habe eine automatische Übersetzung beigefügt. Bitte akzeptieren meine Entschuldigung für die grammatische Fehler.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

Section 40

Presse- und Redaktionsbüro für Public Relations, Magazine, Tages- und Wochenzeitungen
Dreiwerdener Weg 77 c • 09648 Mittweida • Deutschland / Germany

27 NOV 2007
MAILS 2100 07

Section 40 Dreiwerdener Weg 77 c • 09648 Mittweida • Deutschland

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
INFO ACCESS
6TH FLOOR, ZONE E
MAIN BUILDING
WHITEHALL
LONDON, SW1A 2HB

Section 40

28-11-2007-150422-004
EXP 18 DEC 07

UNITED KINGDOM

2007-11-20

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST

Dear Information and Privacy Coordinator:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act. Herewith I respectfully request once more all information or records as well as a complete and thorough search of all your filing systems and locations concerning UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS (UFO) and/or UNIDENTIFIED AERIAL PHENOMENA (UAP). Primarily I request a copy of the report(s) from list below*. Furthermore I respectfully request a printed list with all your available documents/records concerning UFOs and/or UAPs.

***UAP IN THE UK AIR DEFENCE REGION: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**
(the report was published by Ministry of Defence on 15 May 2006)

***UNIDENTIFIED AERIAL PHENOMENA (UAP) IN THE UK AIR DEFENCE REGION - RESULT OF INTERNAL REVIEW**
(the report was published by Ministry of Defence on 1 September 2006)

Disclosure of the requested information to me is in the public interest because it is likely contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and/or military and is not primarily in my commercial interest. If there are any fees for searching for, reviewing, or copying the records, please inform me about the costs (in detail) before you process my request. Please do not ignore this course in reference to my request. Should the records already receive me (without the requested information in advance), I will pay nothing for the documents, which go back to you within one month. If you deny all or any part of this request, please cite each specific exemption you think justifies your refusal to release the information and notify me of appeal procedures available under the law.

Thank you very much for your time, and I look forward to your response. Please send your answer and/or records, if they exist, directly at the following address: **Section 40** Press Office, Dreiwerdener Weg 77 C, 09648 Mittweida, Germany.

Section 40

Section 40 Journalist


Presse- und Redaktionsbüro
Ralf Härtel
Dreiwerdener Weg 77 c
09648 Mittweida
Deutschland / Germany

Telefon **Section 40**
Telefax

Steuer-Nr. beim Finanzamt Mittweida
222/227/01299
Internationale Steueridentifikations-Nr.
Ust-IdNr. DE241045929

Kreissparkasse Mittweida
BLZ 870 510 00
Kto.Nr. 3310014923
IBAN: DE97 8705 1000 3310 0149 23
BIC:WELADED1MTW

Hinweis / Information:
Dieses Schreiben wurde elektronisch
verfasst und bedarf keiner Unterschrift.
This is an electronic produced letter and
require not signature.



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 07-11-2007-073339-006

Expiry: 6 DEC 07

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Section 40 has asked for copies of thirteen UFO reports from South Wales for the last five years.

Also UFO reports from South Wales in 2007.

Case for release of information

I have enclosed the thirteen copies of the UFO reports for South Wales. Personal Information has been removed in accordance with exemption s.40 of the Data Protection Act 1998.

Reports for the current year will be placed on the website in 2008. Therefore, exemption s.22 is (information intended for future publication) has been used.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the release of the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: B1 Name: **Section 40**

Signature: **Section 40**

Date: 26/11/07



From: **Section 40**
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

Section 40

Reporter – South Wales Echo
Thomson House
Havelock Street
Cardiff
South Glamorgan CF10 1XR

Your Reference:

Our Reference:
07-11-2007-073339-006
Date:
26 November 2007

Dear **Section 40**

I am writing with reference to your Freedom of Information request asking for copies of UFO sightings from South Wales for the last five years, including reports in 2007. Your request has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFOs.'

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

Copies of the thirteen UFO sightings that you requested have been enclosed. Names, addresses and telephone numbers have been removed in accordance with exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Finally, reports for the current year will be placed on the website in January 2008. Therefore, as provided by exemption s.22 (information intended for future publication) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The MoD is not obliged to comply with this part of your request.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an

Internal review must be made within 40 days on the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area, with the text "Section 40" written in orange above it.

Section 40

From: Section 40
 Sent: 08 November 2007 15:54
 To: Section 40
 Subject: FW: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 07-11-2007-073339-006

Section 40

Please dig out and copy the original reports for the UFO sightings listed below.

Thanks

Section 40

From: Section 40
 Sent: 08 November 2007 11:37
 To: Section 40
 Subject: re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 07-11-2007-073339-006

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your reply to my request - especially so soon.

I have had a look at the website you recommended and it was very helpful. Please may I subsequently amend my FOI request to the following:

Please could you provide me with UFO sightings in the South Wales area in the year 2007. I have specified the South Wales area.

I have marked out the sightings in our area from the website but was wondering if you could possibly expand on the following reports. I have done a FOI request to the MOD a few years ago for the Rhondda area in relation to UFOs and I was sent a copy of all the reports. Don't worry, I'm not asking for this, but if could you please add any information you have to the following sightings, such as: Precise location reported from? Details of who reported it (name, age, location, occupation)?

Further description?

I hope this is acceptable, please let me know if you have any queries.

Best Wishes,

Section 40

* 20-Feb-05 09:50 Cardiff South Glamorgan
 Bright blue object, that broke into about 3/4 segments and then disappeared.

*02-Sep-05 21:30 Rhossili Bay South Wales
 A bright object was travelling at high speed, horizontally, West to East. The object was a matt white, which looked like marble.

*26-Oct-05 23:58 Wales
 The object looked like a red ball and was the size of a sixpence. It exploded and the whole sky lit up.

*Cardiff South Wales A UFO. (Seen sometime in 2005).

*Pontyclun South Wales A UFO. (Seen sometime in 2005).

*Two UFOs were spotted, and they were clearly not aeroplanes. (Seen sometime in July

09/11/2007

005).

*05-Sep-04 15:20 Barry South Glamorgan

The object was a bright light at first and then looked like a box kite. There was no sound, wings or fuselage.

*08-Sep-04 20:15 Cardiff South Glamorgan

Large flash of light which turned into a grey object descending over Cardiff bay, with trailing smoke behind it.

*15-Jan-03 22:10 Cowbridge South Glamorgan

A large round disc, slightly smaller than the moon. Creamy white then changed green.

*02-Mar-03 15:54 Pontypridd Mid-Glamorgan

Strange object, silver and shaped like a dart.

*12-Jul-03 22:05 Rhonda Mid-Glamorgan

Two round objects with legs, which were black and spinning.

*13-Aug-03 22:55 Maesteg Mid-Glamorgan

Roundish, football shaped. Flashing lights-multi coloured. The lights were on top, then moved around the object.

*24-Sep-03 19:25 Barry South Glamorgan

Saw an unusual object, falling from a cloud, like it was burning, and was very fast. Was viewed for five minutes.

Section 40

Reporter
South Wales Echo

T: Section 40

F: [Redacted]

PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF E-MAIL ADDRESS

IMPORTANT NOTICE This email (including any attachments) is meant only for the int

Any views or opinions in this email are solely those of the author and do not nec

Trinity Mirror PLC is the parent company of the Trinity Mirror group of companies

Section 40

South Wales Echo,
Thomson House,
Havelock Street,
Cardiff,
South Glamorgan.
CF10 1XR.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

REPORT OF AN UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

- a. Name, address and telephone of informant:
 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] MUSTAFA,
- b. Date, time and duration of sighting:
 13 Aug 03, 2255 hrs - Initial Sighting. Object still present at 0040 hrs.
- c. Description of object:
 Roundish (Football shape) flashing lights - Multi Coloured initially around top then lights moved around object.
- d. Exact position of observer:
 Front Master Bedroom Window.
- e. How observed: (naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, still or video camera).
 WITH NAKED EYE, BINOCULARS, VIDEO CAMERA. (30mins)
- f. Direction in which the object was first seen: (A landmark may be more useful than a badly estimated bearing).
 USING COMPASS - NNE
- g. Angle of sight:
 Acute Angle - Object low in sky from observation point.
- h. Distance: (By reference to a known landmark wherever possible)
 FAR DISTANCE - NO ESTIMATE AVAILABLE
- i. Movements:
 Random movement although continued to initial observation area.
- j. Meteorological conditions during observations: (Moving clouds, haze, mist etc).
 Initially clear, longer observation continued, more cloud cover present.
- k. Nearby objects: (Telephone lines; high voltage lines; reservoir, lake or dam; swamp or marsh; river; high buildings; tall chimneys; steeples; spires; TV or radio masts; airfields; generating plant; factories; pits or other sights with floodlights or other night lighting).
 N/A.
- l. To whom reported: (Police, military organisations, the press etc).
 192 - Directory Enquiries - Requested St Athan.
- m. Any background on the informant that may be volunteered:
 N/A
- n. Other witnesses:
 N/A.
- o. Is a reply requested?
 YES.
- p. Date and time of receipt of report:
 13 Aug 03, 2355 hrs.

RECORD OF ANSWERPHONE MESSAGE RECEIVED ON THURSDAY 25TH
SEPTEMBER 2003 @ 08:04



CALLER



Wanted to report a 'UFO' sighting from [redacted] on 29/9/03 19:25 local

[redacted]
Barry
Wales
[redacted]

who saw an unusual object, falling from a cloud, like it was burning, very fast.
Viewed for 5 minutes.

REPORT OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

Date, Time and Duration of Sighting - Local times to be quoted.

12/7/03 22:05L for 10mins

B Description of Object - Number of objects, size, shape, colours, brightness, sound, smell, etc.

2X Round with legs - black - spinning. Size?

C Exact Position of Observer - Geographical location, indoors or outdoors, stationary or moving.

3 miles North of Llantisant, South Wales (See address below). Outdoors. Stationary.

D How Observed - Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, still or movie camera.

Naked eye + binoculars

E Direction in which Object was First Seen - A landmark may be more useful than a badly estimated bearing.

West

F Angular Elevation of Object - Estimated heights are unreliable.

approx 60°

G Distance of Object from Observer - By reference to a known landmark wherever possible.

Not known

H Movements of Object - Change in E, F and G may be of more use than estimates of course and speed.

Stationary

J Meteorological Conditions During Observations - Moving cloud, haze, mist, etc.

Few Cloud at 20,000' approx. Light winds. Excellent Vis

K Nearby Objects - Telephone or high voltage lines; reservoir, lake or dam; swamp or marsh; river; high buildings, tall chimneys, steeples, spires, TV or radio masts; airfields, generating plant; factories; pits or other sites with floodlights or other lighting.

NONE

L To Whom Reported - Police, military organisation, the press, etc.

RAF St Athan + Cardiff ATC

M Name and Address of Informant

[Redacted] Tonyrefal, Rhonda [Redacted]

N Any Background Information on the Informant that may be Volunteered

NONE

O Other Witnesses

Son of Informant

P Date and Time of Receipt of Report

22:20L 12/7/03

The details are to be telephoned immediately to [Redacted]


NOT POSSIBLE
THIS CLOSED
- NO TELETYPE

The completed form report is to be sent by the originating air traffic service unit to the Ministry of Defence Sec (AS), RAF Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB.


REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	Sunday 2 nd March 2003 @ 15:54
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Strange object, silver, shaped like a dart
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	
6.	Approximate distance.	2 miles from informant's home.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	DAS(LA)Ops&Pol1a answerphone
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	 Ynysybwl Pontypridd  
11.	Other witnesses.	
12.	Remarks.	
13.	Date and time of receipt.	Monday 3 rd March 2003 @ 21:27

Return the completed form by fax or post to:

Directorate of Airstaff (Lower Airspace) Operations & Policy 1
Room 
Metropole Building
Northumberland Avenue
WC2N 5BP



REPORT OF AN UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

a. Name, address and telephone no. of informant:

[REDACTED]

PENLLYN
COWBRIDGE

[REDACTED]

b. Date, time and duration of sighting:

15 JAN 03 2210HRS

c. Description of object:

A LARGE ROUND DISC, SLIGHTLY SMALLER THAN MOON.
CREAMY WHITE THEN CHANGED GREEN.

d. Exact position of observer:

NOT KNOWN

e. How observed: (naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, still or video camera).

NAKED EYE

f. Direction in which the object was seen: (A landmark may be more useful than a badly estimated bearing).

SOUTH BY SOUTH EAST

g. Angle of sight:

NOT KNOWN

h. Distance: (By reference to a known landmark wherever possible).

NOT KNOWN

i. Movements:

i. **MOVED TOWARDS THE MOON AND MADE A WHIZZING NOISE**

k. **Meteorological conditions during observations: (Moving clouds, haze, mist etc).**

CLEAR SKY

l. **Nearby objects: (Telephone lines; high voltage lines; reservoir, lake or dam; swamp or marsh; river; high buildings; tall chimneys, steeples; spires; TV or radio masts; airfields).**

NOT KNOWN

m. **To whom reported: (Police, military organisations, the press etc).**

RAF POLICE ST ATHAN, [REDACTED]

n. **Any background on the informant that may be volunteered:**

o. **Other witnesses:**

p. **Is a reply requested?**

q. **Date and time of receipt of report:**

17 JAN 03 1740HRS.


REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

ENCLOSURE
34
NUMBER

✓
no reply,
as address
not given.

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	Date and time of sighting not given.
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Just said that she saw two UFOs but didn't know at first who to contact.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Not given.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	Not given.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Not given.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT


9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	Woman, but did not give name. 
11.	Other witnesses.	Not given.
12.	Remarks.	Just said she was not mad and knew what she had seen, and the two UFOs were certainly not planes.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	29 July 2005 11.30L

✓

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	Date and time not given.
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Not given.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Not given.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	Not given.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Not given.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	 Tyla Garw Pontyclun  
11.	Other witnesses.	Not given.
12.	Remarks.	Not given.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	28 July 2005 14.30L

✓

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	Date and time not given.
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Not given.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Not given.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	Not given.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Not given.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] Cardiff South Wales [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11.	Other witnesses.	Not given.
12.	Remarks.	Not given.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	28 July 2005 14.30L

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

October 26th
11.58 PM
Ty 'nat Wales
Explosion in the sky

I was out walking the dogs near my house when I saw the object like a Red
White ball in the sky. It was the size of a sixpence it exploded. The whole
sky lit up.



✓

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	20 February 2005 09.50L
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Bright blue object, broke into about three to four pieces, before disappearing.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Not given.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	Not given.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Not given.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	[REDACTED] Cardiff South Wales [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11.	Other witnesses.	Not given.
12.	Remarks.	Not given.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	22 February 2005 14.40L



REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	5 September 2004 15.20L
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	The object was a bright light at first and then looked like a box kite. There was no sound, wings or fuselage.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	[REDACTED] were sitting out in their garden.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Both witnessed the object with the naked eye.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	The object after flying towards them, over their garden in Barry, flew due west over Cardiff Airport.
6.	Approximate distance.	2,000 ft to 3,000 ft above them in the sky.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	The object was going quite fast overhead.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	The sky was very clear, was a very sunny day.

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	[REDACTED] Barry South Wales
11.	Other witnesses.	[REDACTED]
12.	Remarks.	[REDACTED] said visibility was excellent and that you could not mistake it for a plane. Was definitely something you could not explain.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	13 September 2004 12.15L

✓

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING


1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	8 September 2004 20.15L
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Large flash of light which turned into a grey object descending over Cardiff bay, with trailing smoke behind it.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Not given.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	Just said over Cardiff bay.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Going quite fast as it was descending.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

(report updated -
after letter - 23/12/05 -
put on both databases) ✓

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	(Date and time not given).
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	Just said a UFO.
3.	Exact position of observer. Geographical location. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Not given.
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	With the naked eye.
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	The UFO was flying over the bay to the West of Swansea.
6.	Approximate distance.	Not given.
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	Was going quite fast.
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	Not given.

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	Das answerphone.
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	[REDACTED] Swansea West Glamorgan [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11.	Other witnesses.	[REDACTED] Cousin saw the UFO too.
12.	Remarks.	[REDACTED] said that he and his cousin saw the UFO at the beginning of the year, but didn't report it. They then thought that perhaps they should, because they thought it was their duty to tell the MOD of what they had seen.
13.	Date and time of receipt.	18 December 2005 10.45L



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: Section 40

Case Number: 29-10-2007-093343-001

Expiry: 23 November 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Copies of any correspondence or sighting reports which occurred on 20/21/22 August 1994. Additionally, Section 40 asked if we had any record of a visit by personnel from RAF Prestwick to a named individual.

If we had information on a sighting report on the 21st August 1994 in Bellingham, Northumberland.

Case for release of information

Copies enclosed of correspondence and sighting reports covering the dates requested. Names, addresses and telephone numbers have been removed though in accordance with Exemption s. 40 (Personal Information) of the Data Protection Act 1998.

No sighting report was found for Bellingham, Northumberland and RAF Prestwick can find no record of their personnel making any visit.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the release of the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: Section 40

Signature: Section 40

Date: 23/11/07



From: **Section 40**
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

Section 40

Stoke on Trent
Staffordshire

Section 40

Your Reference:

Our Reference:
29-10-2007-093343-001

Date:
23 November 2007

Dear **Section 40**

I am writing with reference to your Freedom of Information request asking for copies of any correspondence relating to UFO reports which occurred on 20/21/22 August 1994. Additionally, you asked if we had any record of a visit by personnel from RAF Prestwick to a named individual.

Copies of three correspondence letters and three UFO reports covering the dates requested have been enclosed. Names, addresses, telephone numbers etc have been removed in accordance with exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Data Protection Act 1998.

Finally, with regard to the sighting on the 21st August 1994 in Bellingham, Northumberland, I searched our records and could find no sighting report of that description and RAF Prestwick can find no record of their personnel making any visit.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days on the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of section 50 of Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

From: [REDACTED] ec(AS)2a, [REDACTED]
Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

62

Telephone (Direct Dialling [REDACTED])
(Switchboard) [REDACTED]
(Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference
D/Sec (AS)/12/3

Date
22 August 1994

[REDACTED]

Dear

1. You recently reported to the Ballingry Police a strange sight in the sky which you saw on the evening of Friday 12 August in the Ballingry area.
2. Your report has been passed to this office which has responsibility within the Ministry of Defence for recording such sightings. Our sole interest relates to whether the possibility of a threat to the United Kingdom's air defences exists. If we conclude that no threat to the security of the UK has occurred, we do not attempt to investigate further or try to establish what may have been seen.
3. It is clear from reports we receive that there are many strange things to be seen in the sky. However, we believe that explanations could be found for most of them. Possibilities that spring to mind include aircraft lights or aircraft seen from unusual angles, kites, helium balloons, weather balloons, unusual cloud formations, satellites in orbit or satellite debris entering the atmosphere, ball lightning, fireballs and meteorites. We accept, however, that there will always be some sightings that appear to defy explanation, and we are open-minded on these.
4. In this instance we are satisfied that no threat to the UK's air defence has occurred but have taken careful note of your report and would like to thank you for your interest.
5. If, however, you are interested in pursuing the subject further, you may wish to contact some of the civilian organisations currently engaged in the study of UFO phenomenon. I suggest the following societies:

British UFO Research Association
BM BUFORA

[REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Quest International

[REDACTED]

Contact International (UK)

[REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

From: [REDACTED] ec(AS)2a Rm [REDACTED]
Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

61

Telephone (Direct Dialing) [REDACTED]
(Switchboard) [REDACTED]
(Fax) [REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference

D/Sec (AS)/12/3

Date

22 August 1994

Dear [REDACTED]

1. You recently reported 2 strange bright lights which you saw in the sky very early in the morning of Wednesday 10 August.
2. Your report has been passed to this office which has Ministry of Defence responsibility for recording such sightings. Our sole interest relates to whether the possibility of a threat to the United Kingdom's air defences exists. If we conclude that no threat to the security of the UK has occurred, we do not attempt to investigate further or try to establish what may have been seen.
3. It is clear from reports we receive that there are many strange things to be seen in the sky. However, we believe that explanations could be found for most of them. Possibilities that spring to mind include aircraft lights or aircraft seen from unusual angles, kites, helium balloons, weather balloons, unusual cloud formations, satellites in orbit or satellite debris entering the atmosphere, ball lightning, fireballs and meteorites. We accept, however, that there will always be some sightings that appear to defy explanation, and we are open-minded on these.
4. In this instance we are satisfied that no threat to the UK's air defence has occurred but have taken careful note of your report and would like to thank you for your interest.
5. If, however, you are interested in pursuing the subject further, you may wish to contact some of the civilian organisations currently engaged in the study of UFO phenomenon. I suggest the following societies:

British UFO Research Association

[REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Quest International

[REDACTED]

Contact International (UK)

[REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

From: [redacted] (AS) 2a, [redacted]
Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

60

Telephone (Direct Dialling) [redacted]
(Switchboard) [redacted]
(Fax) [redacted]

[redacted]

Your reference

Our reference

D/Sec (AS)/12/3

Date

22 August 1994

Dear [redacted]

1. You recently reported to Cardiff Air Traffic Control a strange bright object in the Rhonda Valley, which you saw late on Thursday 11th August.
2. Your report has been passed to this office which has Ministry of Defence responsibility for recording such sightings. Our sole interest relates to whether the possibility of a threat to the United Kingdom's air defences exists. If we conclude that no threat to the security of the UK has occurred, we do not attempt to investigate further or try to establish what may have been seen.
3. It is clear from reports we receive that there are many strange things to be seen in the sky. However, we believe that explanations could be found for most of them. Possibilities that spring to mind include aircraft lights or aircraft seen from unusual angles, kites, helium balloons, weather balloons, unusual cloud formations, satellites in orbit or satellite debris entering the atmosphere, ball lightning, fireballs and meteorites. We accept, however, that there will always be some sightings that appear to defy explanation, and we are open-minded on these.
4. In this instance we are satisfied that no threat to the UK's air defence has occurred but have taken careful note of your report and would like to thank you for your interest.
5. If, however, you are interested in pursuing the subject further, you may wish to contact some of the civilian organisations currently engaged in the study of UFO phenomenon. I suggest the following societies:

British UFO Research Association

[redacted]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Quest International

Contact International (UK)

Yours sincerely,

PLOTTED
REPLIED
DISC

129

F/Sigs 266
(Revised 6/92)

Message Form

Security Classification

UNCLAS

Serial No.

Line 1
2
3 DE
4

Routed by

Time

Prepared by

Precedence : Action ROUTINE / Info Routine

Time

DTG :

Month

Year

For single transmission
Transmitted to

Routing indicators

From: OPERATIONS RAF LEEMING

To: MOD SEC (AS) 2A

Channel No / system

Time

Operator

Info:

Message Instructions

Security classification
UNCLAS

SIC(s)
46F

REPORT OF AN UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

AO 2155Z 270894 @ 10 MINUTES @
BO A DULL GLOWING WHITE LIGHT WITH A RED STRIP OF
LIGHT ALTERNATING BETWEEN LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE OF
OBJECT @
CO OUTSIDE OF FACTORY AT SKELTON CLEVELAND @
DO NAKED EYE @
EO OVERHEAD SKELTON @
FO 15° @

Internal distribution:

Page 1 of 2	File No. or reference
Have you been exposed to a classified message? State yes or no in box	Drafter's name and Rank/Grade (In BLOCK letters)
	Branch and telephone No.
for OPR's use	filling time/TOR
R	System
	Operator
	Final check Operator

Releasing Officer's signature

Name (BLOCK letters)

Rank/Grade

Branch and telephone No.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Sec. 1/1/1
30 AUG 1994

Security Classification

Message Form

F/Sigs 26f
(Revised 6/92)

Security Classification

Serial No.

Line 1

2

3 DE

4

Routed by

Time

Prepared by

Time

Precedence : Action

/ Info Routine

DTG :

Month

Year

Routing Indicators

From:

To:

Info:

For single transmission

Transmitted to

Channel No / system

Time

Operator

Message Instructions

Security Classification

SIC(s)

10 DIRECTLY OVERHEAD ○
 20 MOVED TWO MILES N₀E₀ TO OVERHEAD ICI FACTORY AT
 30 REDCAR CLEVELAND IN ABOUT TEN SECONDS ○
 40 SMALL AMOUNTS OF CLOUD AND GOOD VISIBILITY ○
 50 FACTORIES AND HIGH BUILDINGS ○
 60 AIR OPERATIONS RAF LEEMING ○
 [REDACTED] (SALTBURN BY THE SEA)
 70 WITNESSED BY OTHER WORK MATES ○

Internal distribution:

Page 2 of 3 pages

File No. or reference

Drafter's name and Rank/Grade (in BLOCK letters)

Branch and telephone No.

Releasing Officer's Signature

Name (BLOCK letters)

Rank/Grade

Branch and telephone No.

Have you referred to a classified message? State yes or no in box

for OP's use	R	iling time/TOR	System	Operator	Final check Operator

Security Classification

Page Form

Security Classification

UNCLAS

Serial No.

Line 1
2
3 DE
4

Routed by

Time

Prepared by

Time

Precedence : Action / Info Routine

DTG : Month Year

For single transmission

Routing indicators From:

Transmitted to

To:

Channel No /system

Time

Operator

Info:

Message instructions

Security classification

UNCLAS

SIC(s)

26F

1950 Z 28 AUG 94 0

NIL 0

THE INFORMANT TOOK HIS TIME REPORTING THE SIGHTING BECAUSE HE DIDNT WANT TO APPEAR SILLY 0

Internal distribution:

Page 3 of 3 pages	File No. or reference	Releasing Officer's signature
Have you referred to a classified page? Use of NO	Drafter's name and Rank/Grade (in BLOCK letters)	
	Branch and telephone No	Rank/Grade
for OPN/USE R	Timing time/ON	Branch and telephone No
	System	
	Operator	
	Other check (operator)	

Security UNCLAS

PLOTTED
REPLIED
DISSC.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

131
#2

REPORT OF AN UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

AIS/PFS

- A. DATE, TIME, DURATION OF SIGHTING.
21 2230Z AUG 94 For 15 min
- B. DESCRIPTION OF OBJECT.
Number ONE
Size NK
Shape NK
Colours HK
Brightness like two car headlights flashing
Sound none
Smell none
- C. EXACT POSITION OF OBSERVER.
Geographical Location BURGESS HILL W SUSSEX
Indoors/Outdoors
Stationary/Moving
- D. HOW OBSERVED.
Naked eye / Binoculars / Other optical device / Still or cine camera
- E. DIRECTION IN WHICH OBJECT WAS FIRST SEEN.
(A landmark may be more useful than a badly estimated bearing)
SOUTH
- F. ANGLE OF SIGHT. (Estimated heights are unreliable)
80 deg
- G. DISTANCE. (By reference to a known landmark if possible)
- H. MOVEMENT.
Steady
Changing going round in circles
Erratic
- J. MET CONDITIONS DURING OBSERVATION.
Moving clouds scattered cloud, full moon
Haze / Mist
- K. NEARBY OBJECTS/BUILDINGS ETC. none
- L. TO WHOM REPORTED.
Police
Military Organisation
The Press
LATER CIVILIAN

NAME AND ADDRESS OF INFORMANT

[REDACTED] BURGESS HILL

- M. ANY BACKGROUND OF THE INFORMANT THAT MAY BE VALUABLE
10 years in RAF aircraft filter and
air force long experience of aircraft parts
- O. OTHER WITNESSES
Two neighbours

AND I RECEIPT OF REPORT

51340R

REPORT OF AN UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

AIS/PF5

A. DATE, TIME, DURATION OF SIGHTING.
21 1036 LOCAL AUG 10 MIN

B. DESCRIPTION OF OBJECT.
Number ONE
Size NIL
Shape WK
Colours BLACK
Brightness
Sound NONE
Smell BURNING SHOCK

C. EXACT POSITION OF OBSERVER.
Geographical Location
Indoors/Outdoors
Stationary/Moving

HOW OBSERVED.

Naked eye / Binoculars / Other optical device /
Still or cine camera

DIRECTION IN WHICH OBJECT WAS FIRST SEEN.

Heading NW FROM BOROON

HEIGHT OF SIGHT. (Estimate of heights are unreliable)
NIL

DISTANCE. By reference to a known landmark if possible.
TO CHURCH

F. MOVEMENT.

Steady
Changing TOWARDS
Erratic

J. MET CONDITIONS DURING OBSERVATION.

Moving clouds
Haze / Mist CLEAR SUNNY

K. NEARBY OBJECTS/BUILDINGS ETC.

L. TO WHOM REPORTED.

Police HAMPSHIRE
Military Organisation
The Press

M. NAME AND ADDRESS OF INFORMANT.

[REDACTED] BOROON HAMPSHIRE [REDACTED]

N. ANY INFORMATION OF THE INFORMANT THAT MAY BE VOLUNTEERED.

NO

O. OTHER WITNESSES. NIL

P. DATE AND TIME OF RECEIPT OF REPORT

21 0945 & AUG 94-

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 07 November 2007 11:14
To: Section 40
Subject: FOI - UFO Interview - 21 Aug 1994

Section 40

Sorry for the delay in getting back to you. My staff have checked back through our records, files, SDO reports etc and have found nothing relating to the incident you described. In addition, we have 4 staff that were at the Unit in 1994 but none of them can recall anyone going to interview someone reference a UFO. Sorry I couldn't be of more help.

Regards,

Section 40

Squadron Leader
Senior Operations Officer - ScATCC (Mil)

Mil: Section 40

BT:

Fax:

☎



If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk at Email postmaster@nats.co.uk immediately. You should not copy or use this email or attachment(s) for any purpose nor disclose their contents to any other person.

NATS computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system

Please note that neither NATS nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses or any losses caused as a result of viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

NATS means NATS (En Route) plc (company number: 4129273), NATS (Services) Ltd (company number 4129270), NATSNAV Ltd (company number: 4164590) or NATS Ltd (company number 3155567) or NATS Holdings Ltd (company number 4138218). All companies are registered in England and their registered office is at 5th Floor, Brettenham House South, Lancaster Place, London, WC2E 7EN.

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 25 October 2007 23:44
To: Section 40
Subject: FoIA request - reports 20/21/22 August 1994

29-10-2007 - 093343-001
EXP 23 NOV 07

Hello Section 40

Please may I have copies of any correspondence relating to UFO reports which occurred on 20/21/22 August 1994.

I am particularly interested in a particular report, copied below, but would appreciate all material relating to all reports on all three dates from anywhere in the UK.

Of particular interest is the detail from the report:

"Peter was visited in September by two military officials, who claimed to be from RAF Prestwick. They briefly showed Peter some identification and asked many questions pertaining to the object he observed. They also asked for the negatives."

Please can you also check with RAF Prestwick if any such a visit is on record, and if so, provide all related documentation.

The report is copied below, Gloria Dixon is the Director of Investigations for the British UFO Research Association (BUFORA) and is known to me (I will send copies of this request to her as well as the Chairman of BUFORA, Robert Rosamond).

Regards,

Section 40

<http://spacepub.com/users/data/sightings/eng/eng.htm>

Strange Nights in the North

Date: 21st August 1994 Place: Bellingham, Northumberland

Peter Nelson had retired to bed on Sunday, 21st August, when his alarm system went off. It was 11.35pm and Peter got out of bed and checked the house and garden. There appeared to be no problem with intruders, and when checking the garden he looked up at the night sky and noticed a bright object travelling in an easterly direction and moving quite slowly. He went into the rear garden to have a closer look as it came over the Tyne Valley, and could see a glowing outline of what he described as a coppery dome shape. It moved slowly along the valley towards the river Tyne, then changed direction and headed North.

Peter describes his sighting in the following way.

'I could hardly believe what I was looking at. As it came closer I could feel the air pulsating and was aware of ozone in the air. The hairs on my arms started to bristle. As I watched the object I remembered there was some film left in my camera, so I went into the house to get the camera and shouted for my daughter Mary-Anne to come and see the object. I took five photographs of it. The bright light on the bottom of the disc slowly got brighter and it accelerated at great speed to the north.'

Peter's observation time was approximately twelve minutes and he describes the object as being larger than the full moon. He heard no sound, and states that it was a clear, dry and mild night with no cloud cover. This object was also observed by five other people west of Ovington at about 11.30 pm on the same night.

The Hexam Courant and Evening Chronicle carried articles about this sighting and Phil Mantle called me to tell me that photographs had been taken by Peter Nelson. I contacted Peter and he very kindly came to see me bringing the negatives with him and the camera he had used. He left the negatives with me for examination. The photograph

of the UFO shows a coppery dome shaped object with a light emanating from underneath, and the moon clearly visible. The object seen by the other witnesses is described by them as an orangey yellow colour in two parts hovering above the trees, a few miles west of Ovington. This sighting was at 11.30pm, and several of the witnesses said they had never seen anything like it before.

Visit from the Military

Peter was visited in September by two military officials, who claimed to be from RAF Prestwick. They briefly showed Peter some identification and asked many questions pertaining to the object he observed. They also asked for the negatives. However, I had the negatives at that time and so Peter gave them a copy of the photograph of the UFO. They were interested to know about the sound, movement and height of the object and the approximate distance from which Peter had observed it. The men spent over an hour with him and then went down to the golf course nearby, where they used binoculars and appeared to be looking around. Peter has since told me that both he and his daughter felt that their conversation was being taped.

Otterburn Army Range is in close proximity to Peter's home and he and his daughter are used to seeing military activity around the area on a regular basis. Apparently there is going to be a large military base there in the future and there has been a great deal of objection to this from residents in the area.

This photograph will be forwarded to a photographic analysis consultant and I will give you an update on this when I receive his evaluation.

By Gloria Dixon.



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 23 November 2007 13:05

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 22-11-2007-132556-005

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail of 22 November 2007 asking if I could double check the response provided to you on 16 March 2005 under reference 01-03-2005-13581-007 regarding an alleged UFO incident at Llanilar, near Aberystwyth, in January 1983.

I can confirm the MoD has no record of this incident. The Directorate of Air Staff UFO files covering this period have been placed in The National Archive and are now available for examination by the public at The National Archives, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU, Telephone: 0208 876 3444. Details of how to access these records and The National Archives on line catalogue can be found on their website at <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

I am sorry I was unable to be of more assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

23/11/2007

Section 40

From: Section 40 on behalf of DAS-UFO-Office
Sent: 22 November 2007 13:36
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Dear Section 40

Please accept this e-mail as acknowledgement of your request that I revisit our files to check whether our response to you at 01-03-2005-13581-007 was correct. For administrative reasons, it will be allocated a fresh reference number.

I should mention that we have no record of having received your e-mail of 2 November.

Section 40

DAS-FOI
05-H-Section 40
MoD Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

From: Section 40
Sent: 22 November 2007 10:34
To: DAS-UFO-Office
Subject: re my previous email to you

Dear MOD,(I have not received any reply from the email sent to you on
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2007 5:32 PM
Subject: re MOD

Re Llanilar enquiry. Your reference 01-03-2005-13581-007 your letter dated 16th of March 2005
Dear Sir/Madam, You will see from previous correspondence sent to you, and your letter to me dated the 16th of March 2005,that you confirmed no knowledge of any incident involving the attendance of the MOD and Police to a remote farm at Llanilar near Aberystwyth, in January 1983, when a large amount of metal fragments were recovered and removed from the site, details of which were published in the Sunday Express 23.1 83.

I am dissatisfied with your response and would like to know whether you could double check this enquiry prior to an appeal being lodged, as it seems incomprehensible that you have no details of an incident of this nature, taking into consideration the circumstances of the event as published in the Sunday Express.Unless its a hoax

Section 40

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter for private users.
It has removed 4389 spam emails to date.
Paying users do not have this message in their emails.
Try SPAMfighter for free now!

23/11/2007

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 23 November 2007 16:07
To: Section 40
Subject: Fw: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 22-11-2007-132556-005

Dear Section 40

Thanks for replying.

I am satisfied from my own enquiries into this incident that a large amount of metal was recovered from the farmers field, in question and more likely to have have been the remains of an unmanned aerial vehicle, constructed by human hands rather than any material from a UFO.

What puzzles me is why there are no records kept of this material ever having been recoved in the first place, not that I suggest there has been 'any cover up,' bearing in mind it is more likely the material and the report embracing the recovery was in fact lost, but if this is the case, it leads one to wonder how many other such incidents have taken place?

Under the circumstances I can only form my own conclusions as to what has happened here, and will be considering my options as outlined by you, but reiterate my findings have confirmed from their description to be some sort of aircraft, -but in the absence of any other information can only speculate as to the source, without any substantive evidence to support my theory.

Section 40 Retired Police Officer

----- Original Message -----

From: Section 40
To: Section 40
Sent: Friday, November 23, 2007 1:04 PM
Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 22-11-2007-132556-005

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail of 22 November 2007 asking if I could double check the response provided to you on 16 March 2005 under reference 01-03-2005-13581-007 regarding an alleged UFO incident at Llanilar, near Aberystwyth, in January 1983.

I can confirm the MoD has no record of this incident. The Directorate of Air Staff UFO files covering this period have been placed in The National Archive and are now available for examination by the public at The National Archives, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU, Telephone: 0208 876 3444. Details of how to access these records and The National Archives on line catalogue can be found on their website at <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

26/11/2007

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

I am sorry I was unable to be of more assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H **Section 40**

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.503 / Virus Database: 269.16.4/1146 - Release Date: 22/11/2007 18:55

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter for private users.

It has removed 4469 spam emails to date.

Paying users do not have this message in their emails.

Try [SPAMfighter](#) for free now!



AUTHORISATION TO WITHHOLD REQUESTED INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 13-11-2007-073412-010

Expiry:

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Section 40 is asking for details of UFO sightings reported to the MOD from the Northumberland area for the last five years.

Case for withholding information

I have informed **Section 40** that the Ministry of Defence has a database which contains sightings from the year 1998 up to 2006.

The information is being withheld for the year 2007, as it will be added to the website in 2008.

Proposed use of the following FOI Exemptions

Exemption s.22 is used for the sightings for this year – (information intended for future publication).

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: **B2** Name: **Section 40**

Signature: **Section 40**

Date: **18/11/07**

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 15 November 2007 15:59

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-Authorised: FOI Request - 13-11-2007-073412-010.

Dear Section 40

I am writing concerning your Freedom of Information request asking for details of UFO reports from the Northumberland area for the last five years. Your request has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to UFOs.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

With regard to your request for details of UFO sightings over Northumberland, over the past five years, the MoD has placed details of reports for the period 1998-2006 on its website, which can be found at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomofInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports.

Reports for the current year will be placed on the website in January 2008. Therefore, as provided by exemption s.22 (information intended for future publication) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The MOD is not obliged to comply with this part of your request.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1986 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days on the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1
5th Floor, Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall

15/11/2007

Lion
SvVA 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

EX/REJ 10 DEC 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 12 November 2007 18:03

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request PS 13-11-2007-073412-010 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Monday, November 12, 2007 at 18:02:47

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtoccupation: Journalist

txtorganisation: NCJ Media

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2:

txttowncity: Newcastle

txtstatecountry: Northumberland

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txttelephone: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: I would like information on UFO sitings in the Northumberland area.

I would like numbers of sitings reported to the MOD, broken down by year for the last five years, with a break down of exact locations in Northumberland for the last year only, if possible.

Also comparison figures for other parts of the country in the last year only. Thank you.



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 12 November 2007 10:03

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 12-11-2007-091644-016

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 11 November 2007 asking for copies of material on crop circles held by the MoD in file series D/Sec(AS)/12/6.

I should point out that the 12/6 series consists of one file only, entitled "*UFOs – Alleged UFO incident – Crash of Lightning F6 – 8 Sep 1970*". The incident took place over the North Sea and contains no information relating to crop circles. There is no record that this branch ever opened a file on the subject of crop circles. No file on the subject of crop circles was opened by this branch during the period 1991-95.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

12-11-2007 - 09:16:44 - 016

From: Section 40
Sent: 11 November 2007 09:34
To: Section 40
Subject: FOI request - crop circles

EM 10 DEC 07

Dear Section 40

Thanks for your recent email concerning information held by the MOD on the subject of crop circles.

I wish to make a fresh request under the Freedom of Information Act for copies of the material held by the MOD on the crop circles, relating to the period 1991-1995, in the file series D/Sec(AS)/12/6 released to the other requester listed in your Annexe A, request dated 2 August 2007 namely:


"Please send me any information about the title and content of files D/Sec(AS)/12/6 from the file lists, from the PQ background note I mentioned, or from any other source - I think this will resolve the mystery and help clear up any misunderstandings."

Please note this is clearly the same information I initially requested, under the mistaken impression that it was contained within a separate file on crop circles. Please could you supply this material in hard copy format.

I understand I am entitled to a response within 20 days and I look forward to hearing from you,

Regards

Section 40



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 07-11-2007-173339-006

Expiry: 4 Dec 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Details of UFO sightings Cardiff, Bridgend, Caerphilly, Merthyr Tydfil and Rhondda Cynon Taff.

Case for release of information

Information to be withheld as likely to exceed £600 cost

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date: 8/11/07

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 08 November 2007 09:55

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 07-11-2007-073339-006

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 7 November 2007 asking for details of UFO sighting reports from Cardiff, Bridgend, Caerphilly, Merthyr Tydfil and Rhondda Cynon Taff.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

The MoD files on this subject go back to the late 1970s. Copies of UFO correspondence and reports are not held geographically, but are filed in the order in which they are received. Before any of this information can be released, personal data has to be removed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. Clearly, if we were to search for and then process copies of all these reports the costs would quickly exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request. However, if you can narrow the scope of your request to one or two specific years, we may be able to help you.

However, details of sighting reports for the years 1998 to 2006, are held on the Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website. This can be accessed via the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomofInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports. I suspect that this will give you much of the information you are looking for. Details of sightings for 2007 will be placed on the website early in 2008.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

08/11/2007

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

I am sorry I was unable to be of more assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 07 November 2007 13:25

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request 07-11-2007-173339-006 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on
Wednesday, November 7, 2007 at 13:24:56

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtoccupation: Reporter

txtorganisation: South Wales Echo

txtaddress1: Thomson House

txtaddress2: Havelock Street

txttowncity: Cardiff

txtstatecountry: Wales

txtzipcodepostcode: CF10 1XR

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txttelephone: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: Dear Sir/ Madam,

This is a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

I would please like to request the following information:

* Any sightings of Unidentified Flying Objects in the last three years in the the following areas:
Cardiff (city and county), Bridgend, Caerphilly, Merthyr Tydfil and Rhondda Cynon Taff.

*Please could this include: Date and time of sighting, duration, location, who reported the UFO, number of reports made for that particular sighting and what was reported.

If there are any queries on this request please will you contact me immediately and I will endeavour to provide the necessary clarification.

Please can you send the information as Word attachments or PDF files to the following email address:

Section 40

If this is not possible, then please could you post copies of the information to the following postal address:

Section 40 South Wales Echo, Thomson House, Havelock Street, Cardiff, CF10 1XR

Please can you notify me straight away if you do not possess this information, or if you believe someone else holds it.

My telephone number is Section 40. Please call me if you need any further details to comply with this request.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 08-10-2007-090830-001 Expiry: 5 Nov 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Has a decision been made regarding the release of UFO files

If yes how and when will they be released

Copies of discussion documents

Case for release of information

Confirmation that decision to release has been taken can be released

Discussion documents withheld under exemption s.35 Formulation of Government policy

A public interest test is being undertaken

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the release of the aforementioned information subject to public interest case.

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date: 1/11/07

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 01 November 2007 16:02

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-090830-001

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 5 October 2007 asking whether the MoD had decided to release the UFO files held by both DI55 and DAS. Additionally, you asked for details of how and when the department intends to implement this release and for access to records of any discussions relating to this release that have taken place since January 2007.

There are some 160 DAS and DI55 files that deal with the subject of UFOs dating back to the 1970s and it has been decided to place them in the National Archive over the next three years, commencing, it is hoped, in Spring 2008. The release will be undertaken on a rolling programme in chronological order, starting with the oldest files first and will also include Freedom of Information requests received since 2005 relating to UFOs.

Regarding your request for access to documents of any discussions within MoD on the release of files, I can inform you that the Ministry of Defence holds relevant material but we believe this information, which discusses the formulation of MoD policy, falls within the scope of a qualified exemption of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This is exemption S.35 (Formulation of Government Policy). As a qualified exemption, it is necessary for the Ministry of Defence to consider whether there are overriding reasons why disclosure would not be in the public interest.

The Freedom of Information Act requires us to respond to requests promptly and in any case no later than 20 working days after receiving your request. However, when a qualified exemption applies to the information and the public interest test has to be conducted, the Act allows the time for response to be longer than the 20 working days. A full response must be provided within such time as is reasonable in all circumstances of the case and, in response to your requests, it is therefore planned to let you have a final decision on where the balance of public interest lies, by 14 December 2007. However, I would hope that the matter can be resolved quicker than that and I will push for an early response.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Finally, my response of 25 June 2007 to your previous request on this subject, treated exemption s.35 as an *absolute* rather than a *qualified* exemption and therefore failed to point out the need for a formal public interest test. Please accept my apologies for this mistake.

01/11/2007

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 05 October 2007 15:24
To: Section 40
Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 25-06-2007-161221-003

Hello Section 40

Given that three months have passed since your response (reproduced below), please can you advise:

- a) If the MoD has decided to proceed with a wholesale release of UFO files held by either or both DI55 and DAS.
- b) If the answer to any part of (a) is 'Yes', how and when either/both departments propose to implement any such release.

Finally, please may I have access to records of any discussion within the MoD related to the wholesale release of UFO related material since January 2007 until today.

Regards,

Section 40

Section 40 wrote:

> Dear Section 40

>
>
>
> Thank you for your Freedom of Information
> request of 9 May 2007 asking whether DAS UFO files would be subject to
> a wholesale release, whether the 2 year timescale quoted in the Daily
> Star is accurate and whether un-redacted files would be made available
> under the normal Public Records Act legislation. Additionally, you
> asked for copies of any internal and external discussion relating to
> the decision to release the UFO files. Finally, you asked whether the
> recent French release of their UFO records or the Guernsey incident on
> 23 April 2007 or the F-15 incident on 12 January 2007 had influenced
> the decision process regarding the release of UFO files.

>
> The MoD is currently reviewing the status of UFO files held by DAS and
> DIS although no decision has been taken yet. Discussion papers
> relating any release of these files are withheld under exemption s.35
> (Formulation of Government Policy) of the Freedom of Information Act
> 2000.

>
> If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about
> any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me
> in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you
> are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal
> review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th
> Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk).
> Please note that any request for an internal review must be made
> within two calendar months of the date on which the attempt to reach
> informal resolution has come to an end.

>
> If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your
> complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of
> Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the
> Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the
> internal review process has been completed. Further details of the
> role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the
> Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

>
> Finally, please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to
> your request and I should like to thank you for your patience.

>

> Yours sincerely,
>
> **Section 40**
>
> DAS-FOI
> 05-H-**Section 40**
> MoD Main Building
> Whitehall
> London
> SW1A 2HB

AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: Section 40 [redacted]

Case Number: 08-10-2007-090830-001

Expiry: 5 Nov 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Copies of discussion documents surrounding the decision to release the MoD files to the National Archive

Case for release of information

This information should be withheld under exemption s.35 (Formulation of Government Policy).

Whilst there is a public interest in the release of these documents, on balance following a PIT it is felt the need to ensure staff have the space to develop policy and provide frank advice to ministers, means the information should be withheld.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: Section 40 [redacted]

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... Section 40 [redacted]

Date: 11/12/07

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 11 December 2007 15:31

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorised: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-090830-001

Dear Section 40

In my response dated 1 November 2007 to your Freedom of Information request reference 08-10-2007-090830-001, I explained that access to documents of any internal discussions within MoD regarding the release of MoD UFO/UAP files was exempted under exemption s.35 (Formulation of Government Policy), and that additional time was required to conduct a public interest test.

Section 35(1)(a) of the Act provides that information may be exempt from disclosure if it would, or would be likely to, prejudice the formulation or development of government policy. The decision to proactively release such a large number of files to the National Archive, was quite clearly a matter of government policy.

This is not the end of the matter, of course; section 35 is a qualified exemption, meaning that the MOD must assess the balance of public interest in release of the information. We have done this at several levels:

- i. There is an undoubted public interest in the public being able to assess the quality of advice being given to ministers and subsequent decision making based on that advice. Given the level of interest in the matter amongst a small but vociferous section of the public, and the probability that ill informed speculation and conspiracy theories are likely to be rife, it is reasonable that the public have a right to know why the Ministry of Defence has made its decision to release the UFO/UAP files.
- ii. Greater transparency makes government more accountable to the electorate and increases trust; if by releasing these discussion papers we were to demonstrate that the decision to proceed was one taken on good advice and following a sensible debate, this may have a positive effect in increasing public confidence in government decision-making. However, if the advice and debate behind policy-making were routinely disclosed, officials may be less willing to offer frank advice or ministers may be less willing to explore the full range of policy options. There is a risk that officials could come under pressure not to challenge ideas in the formulation of policy, thus leading to poorer decision making. Ministers and officials also need to be able to conduct rigorous and candid risk assessments of their policies in a free space without constant scrutiny. Discussions surrounding the release of these files are still on going. This is a major exercise, which I believe is unique in MoD history. The MoD will be proactively placing a large number of files less than 30 years old in the National Archive in both paper and importantly, electronic format. The practical difficulties of this are still under discussion and may well continue to be for some time. As we work on the transfer of these files to the National Archive, we are coming across a number of challenges and need to be able to discuss and seek solutions without the concern that our discussions will be placed in the public domain while this process is ongoing.

Taking the above arguments into account, in this case, we believe that it would not be in the public interest to disclose the discussion documents surrounding the decision to place the DIS and DAS UFO/UAP files in the National Archive. That having been said, I believe that it will be helpful if I provide you with a little more background as to why the decision was taken. Once a policy decision has been taken and the policy implemented, the position can be reconsidered and it may be that any factual background information can then be disclosed.

11/12/2007

The subject of UFOs is one of the most popular subjects for FOI requests. Answering requests takes a considerable amount of time and resources and can involve officials in days of work, which frequently means trawling through old files to find the information requested. By placing the UFO files on-line at the National Archive in a structured manner, the MoD is able to follow its remit for more open government and, by re-directing applicants to the National Archive site, reduce the amount of time it spends answering requests. By opening our files in this way, we may also help to counter the maze of rumour and frequently ill informed speculation that surrounds the role of the MoD in the UFO phenomena.

I am sure that you will be disappointed with this response, however, if you have any more specific questions, I will attempt to answer them.

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 19 December 2007 10:09

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorised: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-090830-001

Dear Section 40

Further to my e-mail of 11 December 2007, I note that I failed to remind you that on completion of the public interest test, the standard rights of appeal apply, namely that if you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Secondly, I have received a FOI request for copies of the MoD responses to FOI requests 07-11-2007-155411-001 and 08-10-2007-090830-001. Exceptionally, and as a courtesy, since you only received a final response to the latter request on 11 December 2007, I thought it appropriate to inform you that I will be passing them to the individual concerned either today or tomorrow. I should make clear that your personal details, such as name and e-mail address, will be withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information).

Finally, may I offer you my best wishes for the festive season.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

19/12/2007

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 11 December 2007 14:21

To: Section 40

Subject: RE: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-090830-001

Section 40

Only the standard initial response as found in section D of the guidance – copied below – when you come to the final response you just need to set out the argument for and against and say that you are applying the exemption because the balance of public interest is in withholding. What most people forget to do is set out the argument.

This letter is to inform you that the MOD holds information related to your request, but that we believe the information falls within the scope of the following qualified exemption(s): *[State exemption(s) e.g. Section 26 (Defence), Section 27 (International Relations)]* As such it is necessary for us to decide whether, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

The Freedom of Information Act requires us to respond to requests promptly, and in any case no later than 20 working days after receiving your request. However, when a qualified exemption applies to the information and the public interest test has to be conducted, the Act allows the time for response to be longer than 20 working days. A full response must be provided within such time as is reasonable in all circumstances of the case and, in relation to your request, we estimate that it will take an additional [] working days to take a final decision on where the balance of public interest lies. We therefore plan to let you have a response by.....

Section 40

Info-AccessPol 3

MOD Floor 6 E Section 40

Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

Tel: Section 40

BT:

From: Section 40

Sent: 11 December 2007 13:55

To: Section 40

Subject: RE: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-090830-001

Sorry to be a pain, but are the standard paragraphs we use for a normal FOI request appropriate for a PIT? I have looked on the toolkit but can't find anything.

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 10 December 2007 16:15

To: Section 40

Subject: FW: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-090830-001

11/12/2007



DCA Access to Information Central Clearing House Referral Form – New Requests - November 2006

1/ Please complete this form as thoroughly as possible. Referral forms must be used when referring cases to the Clearing House.

2/ When e-mailing this form to the Clearing House, please copy in all relevant departmental contacts in the e-mail cc. field.

3/ You should continue to process the request until a Clearing House case officer contacts you. However, please do not issue a final response before agreement with the Clearing House.

Referring department details and acknowledgement e-mail contacts

Name of department:	Ministry of Defence – Section 40
Departmental Case Ref:	08-10-2007-090830-001

Timeframes

Date request received:	5 October 2007
Deadline for response to applicant (including any PIT extension already issued or due to be issued):	14 December 2007

Case details and analysis:

Name / organisation of applicant and exact wording of request:	<p>Section 40</p> <p>.....please can you advise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) If the MoD has decided to proceed with a wholesale release of UFO files held by either or both DI55 and DAS. b) If the answer to any part of a) is "Yes" how and when either/both departments propose to implement such a release <p>Finally, please may I have access to records of any discussions within the MoD related to the wholesale release of UFO material since January 2007 until today (5 October)</p>
--	--

Please provide a **detailed analysis** of the request. You **must** provide information on:

- Subject matter and sensitivities.
- What Clearing House **triggers** are engaged.
- What information is **held** – **please provide a sample with the referral form if possible.**
- What **exemptions you think** may apply and **why.**
- Whether there is a prospect of using **NCND.**
- Whether **media interest** in the response is likely.
- Any other factors you believe to be relevant.

Internal discussions have been taking place within the MoD as to whether we should release all the UFO related files held by the two named branches (DI55 and DAS).

This resulted in a Ministerial Submission on the subject and Ministers gave their approval for the release of these files to the National Archive. It had been planned to make a formal announcement in Spring 2008 when the first files will become available at the National Archive. However, there is no objection to informing **Section 40** that a decision to release has been made.

Exemption s.35 applies as the information consists of Ministerial Submissions and drafts, together with discussion documents between staff required for the preparation of the Ministerial Submission requiring a policy decision. Release of this information could inhibit free and frank provision of advice to Ministers.

Exemption s.40 applies as the information contains personal information regarding officials.

Exemption s.42 applies as the information contains discussions on Copyright legislation and the FOI, which has potential implications across government.

A Public Interest test is now being conducted.

It is possible there will be press interest, although the MoD press office believe that national press coverage will be withheld until the first files are available for viewing. The decision to release UFO files will be of considerable interest to those members of the public interested in UFOs

Do you need to consider the use of Section 23 or 24?	NO	What case categorisation (1, 2, 3, or 4) does the department believe would be most suitable (see Clearing House toolkit para 24)	4
--	----	---	---

Involvement of other government departments and/or NDPBs:

Is this a suspected round robin request?	NO
If not a suspected round robin, are any other government departments or NDPBs likely to be involved or have an interest in the request?	Yes

If "Yes" or "possibly", please state why and provide contact details for relevant departments where possible:

	Department 1	Department 2	Department 3
Name of Department	The National Archive		
Reasons for (possible) involvement:	Contains details of discussions with their officials on mechanics of placing files with them		
Contact details (if available):			

Contact details of lead departmental FOI practitioner

		Please check if this is first point of contact for Clearing House <input type="checkbox"/>
Name:		
E – mail (check accuracy):		
Telephone Number:		

Contact details of lead departmental policy official

		Please check if this is first point of contact for Clearing House <input type="checkbox"/>
Name:	Section 40	
E – mail (check accuracy):		
Telephone Number:		

Other key contact details (if applicable)

		Please check if this is first point of contact for Clearing House <input type="checkbox"/>
Name and position:		
E – mail (check accuracy):		
Telephone Number:		

From: Section 40
 Sent: 17 July 2007 11:52
 To: Section 40
 Cc: Section 40; IPR-POL1; Section 40
 Subject: FW: 20070507 FOI AND COPYRIGHT
 AI,

We spoke about a meeting to define the issues, but I think Section 40 and Section 40 comprehensive assessments (for which, many thanks) might be enough to produce a first draft. Can you please discuss para 10 with C Mem.

Section 40

The CPDA seem to put a bit of a crimp in DAS' plans to use the pubn scheme. Grateful for your thoughts, esp possible loopholes.

Section 40

DD Info Access
 MB 06.E. Section 40
 Section 40
 Info-AccessPoIDD

Section 40

From: IPR-POL1
 Sent: 16 July 2007 18:36
 To: DAS-FOI; Section 40
 Subject: RE: 20070507 FOI AND COPYRIGHT

Section 40

- 1) Further to my telephone advice referred to at the bottom of this e-mail chain, I wish to formally set out the advice of the Directorate of Intellectual Property Rights on this issue.
- 2) I understand that DAS proposes to publish on the internet its records of UFO sightings. The records comprise largely of photographs, diagrams and letters created by members of the public, together with MOD responses to those letters.
- 3) The photographs, diagrams and letters written by the members of the public are protected by copyright under the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 as amended ("CDPA"). I shall refer to these as "third party works".
- 4) Section 16(d) restricts the "*communication of [a] work to the public*". "Communication to the public" is defined by section 20(2) as: "*the making available to the public of a work by electronic transmission in such a way that members of the public may access it from a place and at a time individually chosen by them*". These sections were inserted into the CDPA in order to enact the Information Society Directive (2001/29/EC). The provisions are specifically designed to cover the act putting of copyright material onto the internet.
- 5) Other acts restricted by copyright include "*copying*" a work and "*issuing copies to the public*". These acts are separately defined in sections 17 and 18 CDPA. It is important to note that "copying" and "issuing copies to the public" are separate, defined, acts under the CDPA.
- 6) The CPDA includes a number of "defences" permitting activities that would otherwise constitute infringement of copyright. Several of these defences relate to public administration. The legality of MOD's plans hinge entirely on whether MOD has a "defence" permitting it to "communicate" the third party works to the public.
- 7) Unfortunately, there is no defence available that would permit the proposal described in paragraph 2 above:
 - Section 47 CDPA permits the "*copying*" and "*issuing to the public*" of material "*open to public inspection*" to enable the material to be inspected at a more convenient time or place. This defence is generally believed to permit third party works to be copied and issued to FOIA enquirers. However, section 47 does not permit third party works to the "*communicated to the public*".
 - Section 48 CDPA concerns information communicated to the Crown in the course of public business. Although there is room for an opposing view, I would concur with DGLA's opinion that the defence

applies to works communicated to the Crown following the enactment of the Freedom of Information Act, but does not apply to earlier works. However, Section 48 only permits the work to be "copied" and "copies issued to the public": it does not permit third party works to be "communicated to the public".

- Section 49 CDPA provides a defence in respect of public records, open to public inspection in pursuance of the Public Records Act. These records can be "copied" and a "copy supplied to any person". However, again, there is no permission to "communicate the work to the public".
 - Section 50 CDPA permits acts "specifically authorised by an Act of Parliament". It is debatable whether the Freedom of Information Act contains any specific authorisation to undertake an act ordinarily restricted by the CDPA. However, again, there is certainly no specific provision in the FOIA permitting third party works to be "communicated to the public".
- 8) **In conclusion, MOD would be exposed to liability for copyright infringement were it to proactively, or indeed reactively, place the third party works on the internet.**
 - 9) I have spoken to Mr Tim Padfield of the National Archives, whom I regard as the most knowledgeable authority on copyright law in this area. He concurs with my view, and has explained that National Archives does not put third party works onto the internet unless cleared with the copyright owner. Instead, National Archive's policy is to use the section 49 defence to supply electronic copies of third party works on demand.
 - 10) As DGLA has explained, section 49 only applies to "public records", open to public inspection. I have limited knowledge of the application of the Public Records Act: however, I presume the Act requires the documents to be sent to Kew, the Imperial War Museum, or to another authorised depository. Nevertheless, this might be a way forward: National Archives already has the people and systems in place to deal with large numbers of requests to inspect government records, including third party works. Furthermore, my understanding is that documents do not necessarily need to be 30 years to be sent to Kew. DG Info should know more about this.
 - 11) I can see no other way forward, but remain happy to advise on any proposals that develop.

Section 40

Section 40

Directorate of Intellectual Property Rights

Section 40

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 16 July 2007 11:37
To: IPR-POL1
Cc: Section 40
Subject: FW: 20070507 FOI AND COPYRIGHT

Section 40

You will recall we spoke about the release of letters from the public on the MoD publication scheme. We have sought opinion from DGLS on the matter and received the advice below and would be grateful for your comments.

Section 40 at Info Access has agreed to lead on this matter and to provide USofS' office with a submission on the approach the Department should take. I think he will probably wish to have a meeting of interested parties in due course.

At the risk of appearing to slope shoulders on this, can I ask you to contact Section 40 discuss a way forward?

Your early comments would be very much appreciated.

Section 40

DAS-FOI

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 16 July 2007 10:03

To: Section 40
Cc: USofS-APSI
Subject: RE: 20070507 FOI AND COPYRIGHT

Section 40

Thank you for pursuing this. The advice does raise questions about the wider use of the publication scheme if there is doubt about what we can and cannot place on it. US of S office are looking for clear guidance on this issue and as the policy branch I think it falls to you to make a submission. It is fortuitous that the UFO question has brought the issue to the fore and Minister needs to understand the legal aspects of publication and be given the appropriate advice on the line the Department should adopt.

I am copying this to Section 40 to keep him in the picture.

Regards

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 06 July 2007 08:56
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: 20070507 FOI AND COPYRIGHT

Section 40

Well you did ask. Will you take this back to the IPR team and discuss with us further if necessary?

Regards,

Section 40

DD Info Access
 MB 06.E. Section 40
 0207 218 1274
 Info-AccessPoIDD

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 05 July 2007 16:15
To: Section 40
Subject: 20070507 FOI AND COPYRIGHT

Section 40

This refers to your note below.

2 I have not seen the advice of the IPR specialists in Abbeywood who in any event [because of their expertise in the area] should be asked to comment further in light of what I say below. However, the position seems to me to be as follows.

3 On the face of it no breach of copyright should result in respect of a letter put on the publication scheme-

a) where it has been opened as a public record in accordance with the Public Records Acts, although there may still be breaches of confidence or the Data Protection Act 1998 as a consequence, depending on the information in it [see 7 below]; or

b) on the basis of a reasonable argument, in a case where, (i) it has not already been generally published, (ii) it has been sent to the Department on a day after the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, and (iii) were a Freedom of Information request made, the information in it

would be disclosed [see 8 below and in particular the last sentence].

4 However, it seems to me that the proper process to follow would be to open the letter as a public record [taking account of matters relevant to confidence and data protection] in view of what is said in 8, since in that case there is little chance of there being a breach of copyright. In any event, I do not think it makes any difference whether or not any reference is made on the material to the effect that it is subject to copyright.

5 It is settled that a letter is a literary work and that copyright subsists in it. That copyright belongs to the writer and does not confer on the receiver a licence to publish. A letter is likely to include personal data within the meaning of the Data Protection Act 1998 and is likely to have been sent to the Department in expectation that it would be kept confidential as to the sender and, dependent on its terms, also its contents [although those matters do not necessarily mean that an actionable breach of confidence may be sustained in the event of its publication but as to whether confidence exists will need to be determined on a case by case basis].

6 Pursuant to s3 of the Crown Proceedings Act 1947, civil proceedings lie against the Crown for an infringement of copyright committed by a servant or agent of the Crown but otherwise no proceedings lie against the Crown by virtue of the 1947 Act. In my view, an official putting the material into the public domain via a publication scheme will be an infringement of the copyright, unless a defence can be made out [see 7-9 below].

7 Pursuant to s49 of the Copyright and Designs Act 1988, material in public records which are open to inspection may be copied and supplied to any person without infringing copyright: this means that files which have been placed in the National Archives [or held for the National Archives in a designated place of deposit eg the Department] and opened for inspection by the public will not be subject to restrictions of copyright.

8 Pursuant to s48 of the 1988 Act, where a literary work has been communicated to the Crown in the course of public business, the Crown may, for the purpose for which the work was communicated or any related purpose which could reasonably have been anticipated by the copyright owner, copy the work and issue copies of it to the public without infringing copyright. However, the Crown may not do so, if the information has previously been published otherwise than by virtue of that section. It seems to me that in this case the work [the letter] will have been communicated to the Department for the purpose of informing the Department about UFOs; a related purpose to which the Department could put the letter is to inform others. In the era of the information rights regime it seems to me that, save to the extent to which an exemption under the Freedom of Information Act applies (for example s40 (personal information) or s41 (an actionable breach of confidence)), it should be within the reasonable anticipation of the sender of the letter that it would be made public either in answer to a request or through the publication scheme which forms part of the structure of the information rights regime. However, the danger lying in this section is that, if the letter has already been published, for example put into circulation within or outside of the EEA on the internet, the defence in the section will not apply and there may be no way of telling whether this is the case.

9 Usual defences to the commission of a tort will also apply to a breach of copyright, for example acquiescence in the breach or delay in pursuing it; however, on the face of it they are unlikely to apply in this case.

Happy to discuss further.

Section 40

MOD DGLS
legal adviser

From: Section 40
Sent: 28 June 2007 10:43
To: Section 40
Cc: Section 40
Subject: FOI AND COPYRIGHT

Section 40

This subject has been knocking around for a while but I'm not sure if you have been formally consulted. **Section 40** from DAS would be grateful for your advice.

The Air Staff wish to place all the Department's UFO files into the publication scheme in order to deflect the constant, resource-intensive flow of individual RFIs. They have received advice from the IPR lawyers that much (if not all) of the material sent in by the public is subject to copyright and cannot therefore be published on the website. Contacting individual contributors for permission to publish is not practical. But we know that copyright is not a justification to withhold from an individual RFI. So we appear to be in the illogical position where we must provide this information reactively, but not proactively.

Is this true and, if it is, can we do anything about it – e.g. adding a strapline to each web page saying that this material may be subject to copyright? Or can we assume that the material was given to us to use as we see fit?

Section 40

DD Info Access

MB 06.E. **Section 40**

Section 40

Info-AccessPoIDD

Section 40

20070906 U MINSUB UFO FILES

X Sep 2007

APS/USofS

Copy to:

APS/SofS	PS/CDI
APS/MinDES	MA/DCDI
APS/MinAF	DG Info
PS/PUS	DAS
PS/CAS	D News (RAF)
PSO/ACAS	DNews/PS
Special Advisors	D Ne [redacted] Pol 2
	SO1 Air & Ops Dev

Through DAS AD (Secretariat)

RELEASE OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT (UFO) AND AERIAL PHENOMENA (UAP) FILES

Issue

1. Proactive transfer to the National Archives of MOD files related to UFOs and UAPs.

Recommendation

2. That the Minister:
 - a. approves the transfer of UFO and UAP files held by DAS and DIS to the National Archives progressively over the next three years;
 - b. agrees that a formal press announcement should be made at the time the first files are transferred, planned to be in February 2008.

Deleted: October this year

Timing

3. Routine.

Background

4. Since the end of WW2, MOD has been tasked with recording and, from time to time, investigating UFO sightings. Contrary to what many members of the public may believe, MOD has no interest in the subject of extraterrestrial life forms visiting the UK, only in ensuring the integrity and security of UK airspace.

5. DAS and DIS have some 160 files that deal with the subject of UFOs dating back to the 1970s. Of these, the majority contain correspondence with members of the public, with the next largest category being sighting reports. The remainder comprise PQ and Policy files and a small number of files that cover peripheral subjects. The majority of the information held on the 27 DIS files is likely to duplicate that held by DAS. DAS also holds a considerable number of files covering FOI requests and responses on the subject of UFOs which will also need to be released. In total over the course of the proposed 3 year programme, some 180 existing files will be released, with a further 20 new files being created over the same period, also requiring release at a future date

6. The files held by DAS and DIS are of keen interest to a large worldwide group of amateur and professional "ufologists". As a result, MOD receives a large number of, often complex, FOI requests each year for information regarding UFOs (DAS alone receiving 199 in 2005, 140 in 2006 and 120 to date in 2007).

7. DIS has already made a written commitment to review its files for release in a response to an FOI request from an academic researcher. This, and the decision by the French National Centre for Space Studies to release their UFO files earlier this year, has increased the, already significant, press and internet speculation that we are about to release our own.

Benefits from publication

8. In addition to the clear presentational benefits in meeting public demand and expectation, release of the files would also smooth the workload on DIS and DAS. The processing of FOI requests on the subject of UFOs is becoming increasingly costly and time consuming, especially if the Department's responses are challenged. The piecemeal release of information also fuels unhelpful speculation from those who believe there are issues that MOD are trying to hide. It is expected that within relatively few years, FOI requests on the subject will require the MOD to release virtually all its UFO files and it is considered beneficial that the release be managed in a structured manner.

9. It is not expected that the volume of requests about UFOs will significantly reduce (indeed, in the short term, press coverage may lead to an increase). However, section 22 of the FOI Act exempts from release information which public authorities have a "view to publication" at a future date. By making a clear commitment to publish these files, DAS and DIS can therefore stop responding reactively to requests as they are received and instead manage their effort in a more organised manner. Whilst the time scale over which we can claim exemption under s.22 has not yet been tested, it is believed that invoking the exemption on the basis that we will publish information sometime within the next three years would be inappropriate and pose presentational difficulties. Instead it is believed use of this exemption should be limited to those instances when it is planned to release the relevant information within a 12 month period.

Mechanism of release

10. In order to maximise the presentational benefit, it would be preferable to publish the files on the internet using the MOD publication scheme. However, some 40% of the information in the files is correspondence from the public. This material is subject to the Copyright Designs and Patents Act (CDPA) 1988, which prohibits its publication on the internet. Publication of only the remainder of the information, not protected by copyright, would fuel accusations of a "cover-up" and undermine our presentational objectives.

11. It should be noted that the MoD has already placed two redacted files on the publication scheme together with a small number of non MoD documents. Although this move has been greeted with approval from ufologists, it may be never the less be necessary to remove them in order to comply with copyright obligations.

12. The alternative proposed is to transfer the files to The National Archives (TNA). Once transferred, the material would be "published" under the terms of the FOI Act, allowing MOD to refuse specific requests under section 22 and therefore to manage the files' release in a structured manner. Transferred material would all be available electronically on demand through the TNA website, as there is a specific exemption in the CDPA to provide public records in this way, even when this includes material subject to copyright. It is unusual for files to be transferred to TNA so far in advance of the usual 30-year review point. However, it is assessed that the high level of public interest and lack of sensitive material in the files means that no precedent is set by their early release. Corporate Memory and TNA are content with our transfer plan. Although 'publication' of the files to TNA does not provide the flexibility of using our own website, doing so still largely delivers the benefits set out above. However, it is important to note that unlike existing MoD practice, TNA will impose a charge of £3.50 to view or download each file.

Deleted: for information provided

13. The majority of the files are of low security classification but include references to air defence matters, defence technology, relations with foreign powers and occasional uncomplimentary comments by staff or police officers about members of the public, which will need to be withheld in accordance with FOI principles. In particular, the PQ files will require considerable work before they can be transferred as they contain background notes for Ministers, but there is no reason, in principle, why they cannot be released and, indeed, a small number of background notes for PQs have already been released under FOI. The MoD is aware of no clear evidence to prove or disprove the existence of aliens and consequently the files are considerably less exciting than the "industry" surrounding the UFO phenomena would like to believe.

14. The most cost effective solution is to scan the files (~£13K), and purchase specialised redaction software (£2K). It is estimated that with current staffing levels, it will take approximately three years to complete, with the release conducted around the continuing normal duties of both branches.

Files covering a complete year will be released on a rolling programme, in year order, with the oldest files being reviewed for release first. It is expected that on average, it will be possible to release a years files roughly every two months. DAS files up to and including 1984 have already been passed to TNA, which will mean that the first few files to be released will be from DIS, which holds files back to the 1970s. Files will be transferred in chronological order with those covering 1979-92 released in 2008, 1992-2000 in 2009 and 2001 onwards in 2010.

Deleted: DIS expects to be able to release their first files, following review and redaction, in October 2007.

Presentation

15. There have been several national press articles in the past year on this topic (attached at Annex C). Subsequently, any announcement of a more general release of files is likely to attract a great deal of interest from the press and general public. There is a risk that media will overplay the MOD's involvement in these cases, therefore we will need to manage our message and be prepared to deal with a high level of media interest.

16. Press Office advice is that a Ministerial decision to release the files is not newsworthy in itself. It is therefore proposed that D News will issue a press notice when the first file(s) is transferred to TNA. This may be accompanied by internet publication of selected material, not subject to copyright, on the MOD website to ease access for the media. We would not recommend that a Ministerial quote is included in this press release as it could be taken out of context.

17. The press office will hold defensive lines to take, attached at Annex A.

18. A draft press release to co-incide with the release of the first documents is attached at Annex B.

(signed on DII)

Section 40

DAS FOI

MB 5.H. **Section 40**

AUTHORISED BY: **Section 40**
GRADE/RANK: B2
BRANCH: DAS AD (Secretariat)

TEL: **Section 40**

From: Section 40
Sent: 18 May 2007 10:15
To: Section 40
Cc: Section 40
Subject: FW: UFO sub

Attachments: Ministerial Submission - Release of UFO Files - Press Office version-amended.doc;
Annex B draft UFO press release - Press Office version-amended.doc
Paul,

As discussed, please find attached some suggested amendments to the Ministerial Submission and, especially, the Press Release. We remain of the opinion that reference to 'aliens' should not be included, hence some of the wording being removed from para 10.

Please give me a call if you wish to discuss further.

Section 40
DI CSD Sec3
MB04.J. Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 17 May 2007 17:18
To: Section 40
Cc:
Subject: RE: UFO sub

Section 40

Thanks

Comments passed via angela this pm

Section 40

Section 40
Head of DIS Secretariat
(DI CSD-Sec Hd)
03.H. Section 40
MOD
Civ Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 17 May 2007 16:58
To: Section 40
Cc: Section 40
Subject: FW: UFO sub

Section 40

Please see attached and below. The Press Office have drafted a press release and have also made some suggested amendments to the Ministerial Submission, do you have any comments on either and is the Submission now in line with what you agreed with Section 40?

Section 40
DI CSD Sec3
MB04.J. Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 17 May 2007 16:31
To: Section 40
Cc:
Subject: UFO sub

Section 40

Suggested amendments attached along with draft press release.

Only key amendment we need to make to the newsbrief will be a LTT on the documents we are withholding. This will be the key 'conspiracy theory' that people will jump on.

While your looking at this I'll scan in the recent coverage that I think we should attach in a seperate Annex C

Sorry for delay.

Section 40

MoD Press Office

Tel: Section 40
Mil:
Fax:



AUTHORISATION TO WITHHOLD REQUESTED INFORMATION

Applicant: Section 40

Case Number: 22-10-2007-072008-005

Expiry:

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Section 40 had asked for all UFO sighting reports from Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly in the past 12 months.

Case for withholding information

I have withheld the information on Section 22 of the Freedom of Information Act. (information intended for future publication). The information will be put on the web in January 2008.

Proposed use of the following FOI Exemptions

Section 22.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: Section 40

Signature..... Section 40

Date:..... 24/10/07

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 24 October 2007 11:33

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-Authorised: FOI Request - 22-10-2007-072008-005

Dear Section 40

I am writing concerning your Freedom of Information request asking for details of UFO sighting reports from Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly in the past twelve months. Your request has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to UFOs.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

With regard to your request, for sighting reports reported to the MOD from Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly in the past twelve months, the Ministry of Defence has a database which contains this information, which covers details of reports from 1998 to 2006. The Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website can be accessed via the internet at:

<http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomofInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports.

Reports for the current year will be placed on the website in January 2008. Therefore, as provided by exemption s.22 (information intended for future publication) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the MOD is not obliged to comply with this part of your request.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1986 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website,

<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1
5th Floor, Zone H

24/10/2007

1 Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 22 October 2007 09:15
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 22-10-2007-072008-005 Section 40

Categories: FOI Information Request

Section 40

Can you answer this please.

Section 40

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 22 October 2007 07:21
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 22-10-2007-072008-005 Section 40

Section 40

Can I interest you with this FOI request?

Regards

Section 40

FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 19 October 2007 11:04
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 22-10-2007-072008-005 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Friday, October 19, 2007 at 11:03:48

txttitle: Section 40
txtfirstname: Section 40
txtlastname: Section 40
txtoccupation: Reporter
txtorganisation: Cornwall and Devon Media
txtaddress1: The West Briton, Harmsworth House,
txtaddress2: City Wharf, Malpas Road, Truro.
txttowncity: Truro
txtstatecountry: Cornwall
txtzipcodepostcode: TR1 1QH
txtcountry: Great Britain
txtemailAddress: Section 40
txttelephone: Section 40
txtinforequest: Please can you supply details of all UFO sightings in Cornwall and the

Isles of Scilly that have been investigated by the Ministry of Defence in the past 12 months.

Please can this information include the location of each sighting, the number of reports it prompted and the outcome of each MoD investigation.

Many thanks,

Section 40 [REDACTED]



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 18-10-2007-091419-001 Expiry: 14 Nov 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Details of UFO sighting made 17 Nov 2003 Bromley

Case for release of information

Relevant documents have been provided

Names, addresses etc of individuals have been redacted under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) Freedom Information Act.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the release of the aforementioned information subject to exemptions under FOI.

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date: 18/10/07

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 18 October 2007 10:45
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 18-10-2007-091419-001
Attachments: UFO Bromley.mdi

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 17 October 2007 asking for further details of an alleged UFO sighting on 17 November 2003 in Bromley listed on the MoD Publication Scheme.

I attach copies of the relevant documents. Names, addresses, telephone numbers etc have been withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI
05-H-Section 40
MoD Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

18/10/2007

NFA. Report already received & processed.

24/11/03

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



Unidentified Flying Object (UFO) Reports

Report of Unidentified Flying Object	
Date	17 NOVEMBER 2003
Time	0225
Sighting Duration	UNKNOWN
Description of Object	20-30 FLASHING RED + WHITE LIGHTS MOVING QUICKLEY RESIDENT VIDEODED THE INCIDENT.
Exact Position of Observer	BROMLEY KENT
How Object was Observed	NAKED EYE
Direction in which Object was First Seen	UNKNOWN
Angular Elevation of Object	UNKNOWN
Distance of Object from Observer	UNKNOWN
Movement of Object	ZIE ZAGGING
Meteorological Conditions During Observations	UNKNOWN
Nearby Objects	UNKNOWN
To Whom Reported	NEW SCOTLAND YARD SET [REDACTED] REF CADGZS
Name of Informant	UNKNOWN 2 ADULTS + 1 CHILD.
Address of Informant	UNKNOWN
Background Information on Informant that may be Volunteered	UNKNOWN
Other Witnesses	A POLICEMAN SENT TO INVESTIGATE CONFIRMED THE SIGHTING OBJECTS WERE MOVING FASTER THAN ANY MAN MADE AIRCRAFT.
Date of Receipt of Report	0330 17 NOVEMBER 2003
Time of Receipt of Report	0330

D UK/270/1/13

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



18 Nov 03

DAS Sec 3

CREDIBLE WITNESS 'UFO' REPORT - 17 NOV 03

Reference:

A. D/Sec(AS)/64/2 dated 17 Nov 03.

At Reference, you asked whether the report submitted by Sgt [REDACTED] from New Scotland Yard, through Plt Off [REDACTED] at CRC Neatishead, regarding "20-30 red flashing lights in the sky accompanied by a whirring noise" at 0225hrs on 17 Nov 03 at Bromley in Kent, represented anything of air defence interest. CRC Neatishead have reviewed the radar tapes for the time period specified and other than routine air traffic in the area, nothing additional was detected in the area despite good radar coverage. Therefore, I can now confirm that the incident does not represent anything of air defence interest.

Signed on CHOtS

[REDACTED]
Wg Cdr
DUK SO1 Air Ops 2
[REDACTED]

Action:

Sgt [REDACTED] at New Scotland Yard not on duty. Message of outcome passed to control room. No details of the people reporting this sighting so unable to reply direct. Police given my telephone number in case Sgt [REDACTED] wanted to contact me or pass us the address of those reporting the sighting.

19/11/03.

LOOSE MINUTE

D/Sec(AS)/64/2

17 November 2003.

D UK-SO1 AIR

17 Nov 03

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

CREDIBLE WITNESS REPORT DATED 3 NOVEMBER 1999.

1. In line with our current policy, please find below a 'UFO' report which you may wish to be aware of. Although the report was originally from a member of the public, these lights were also seen by Police Officers and a Police helicopter crew. Swanwick and RAF Neatishead have also become involved. I would be grateful if you could let me know if the report represents anything of air defence interest.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

DAS-Sec3

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Follow-up UFO Report - 170612z Nov 03

UFO report relayed to STCDO from the Duty Surveillance Officer Fg Off [REDACTED] at RAF Neatishead who had received the report from F/Sgt [REDACTED] at Swanick Mil ext [REDACTED] Fg Off [REDACTED] has also passed this report to MOD Sec (AS) 2a and to CAOC 9 - Flt Lt Al [REDACTED]

F/Sgt [REDACTED] had received the report from Sgt [REDACTED] of New Scotland Yard Ref. No CAD 625 contact Tel No [REDACTED]

'At 2.25am 17 Nov 03 2 adults and 1 child in Bromley, Kent saw 20-30 red flashing lights in the sky accompanied by a whirring noise and they recorded the occurrence on video tape. The family called the police who confirmed the sighting. The policeman using a lamppost as a marker concluded the lights were zigzagging / turning across the sky at a speeds faster than any man-made aircraft.

A crew of a police helicopter airborne at the time also confirmed the lights but they thought they might be lights of aircraft on the approach in to LHR. However Swanick Mil declared that there were no aircraft in the approach pattern at that time all aircraft on their radar were at high level.'

S/L [REDACTED]
STCDO-C
Ext [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Message left on DAS answerphone at 05.34 Monday 17th Nov by Pilot Officer [REDACTED] of RAF Neatishead. UFO sighting details as above reported to Neatishead at 04.00 by Swanwick ATC. The sighting was confirmed by the Police and Scotland Yard reported it to Swanick Mil. Police helicopter in the area thought they were aircraft approaching Heathrow but Swanwick say there were no such aircraft in the area.

Pilot Officer [REDACTED] is on Neatishead Crew Room [REDACTED] or mobile number [REDACTED]

Section 40

18-10-2007 - 091419-001
EXP 14 NOV 07

From: Section 40
Sent: 17 October 2007 20:46
To: DAS-UFO-Office
Subject: Police helicopter

Title - Section 40
Surname - Section 40
Forename -
Address - BROMLEY KENT
Email - Section 40

Phone - Section 40
Facsimile -
Organisation -
Position -
Request text.

Dear Sirs,
Could you please supply information on the below event especially the reports taken from the police (or whoever) at the time. I believe this is what you would have used to compile your recent MOD release scheme.

On the 17 November 2003 (02.25) according to the MOD Publication scheme a Police Helicopter reported:
"There were 20-30 red flashing lights in the sky accompanied by a whirring noise". Which, I believe were all around the helicopter.
Could you supply any further details of this event such as the original report (as it did not involve a crime)


Section 40

Below is a link to the MOD page where a scroll down to the second page will find the entry for 17 November 2003

<http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/EFDfEBB0-87E0-4D8A-87B5-8A81493AA247/0/UFOReports2003WholeoftheUK.pdf>

or

[Police Helicopter](#)



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 16 October 2007 15:53

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 16-10-2007-105758-002

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 15 October 2007 asking whether in recent years there were any air space violation incidents involving unknown objects.

The MoD has no record of any such incidents.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

16/10/2007

Section 40

16-10-2007-105758-002
EXP 13 NOV 07

From: Section 40
 Sent: 15 October 2007 17:05
 To: Section 40
 Cc: InfoXD@mod.uk
 Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-08-2007-151226-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your kind response. Would you be able to clarify the structure of a pertinent sentence in your reply? You mentioned:

"[MoD is] not aware of investigations that"

The key word is 'investigations'. I believe my inquiry asked if there were any airspace violation incidents involving unknown objects (regardless of whether or not there was an accompanying investigation). Your response indeed clarified that there were no formal investigation into potential incidents, however, it did not address the core of my question, which was aimed to determine if any airspace violation incidents occurred in general.

If you can clarify whether or not unknown object airspace violation incidents have occurred in the first place, and the number of which that have occurred in recent history, I would appreciate that. You have already established there were no formal investigations, so I will not expect to receive documentation to that effect, but I would expect to receive a lighter set of documentation that includes original (and dated) incident reports and any documentation that can speak to the number of unknown object airspace violations that have occurred, along with any preliminary investigative reports into these matters.

Thank You,

Section 40

On Oct 15, 2007, at 6:43 AM, Section 40 wrote:

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 2 August 2007 which asked whether there were any incidents of unauthorised violation of airspace by an unknown object, whether such air activity was investigated and whether the investigation revealed whether any of the objects had entered UK airspace from outside the earths atmosphere.

Firstly, please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to you which was due to the need to consult with colleagues in the RAF Air Defence and Space Surveillance community, who are not aware of, and therefore do not hold any records of, any

16/10/2007

investigations that have identified an unauthorised violation of UK airspace by any unknown aerial object.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40 Wg Cdr
Sent: 16 October 2007 13:56
To: Section 40
Subject: RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-08-2007-151226-003

Section 40

Many thanks; sorry to dash off but as usual I am trying to do many things at the same time. I have had a quick think and do not see that the semantics make any difference here. The crux of it is we do not have unidentified things, we historically, have always known, to my knowledge at least what the object has been in at least generic terms and therefore have not investigated any unknown objects.

For your background, not for the response we will investigate unidentified aircraft and any other objects we will have knowledge of the type of object from when it was in space. The UFO piece is usually only invoked as part of a call that comes in and we will then check back whether this correlated with anything on our systems and I am unaware of any such occasions when it has

Hope this helps

Section 40

Wg Cdr
 SO1 Air & Ops Dev
 CT & UK Ops
 MOD Main Building
 Floor 4 Zone I

Section 40

CTandUKOps-SO1 Air & Ops Dev (DII)
 Section 40 (DII)

From: Section 40
Sent: 16 October 2007 11:21
To: Section 40 Wg Cdr
Subject: FW: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-08-2007-151226-003

Section 40

Electronic copy for you.

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 15 October 2007 17:05
To: Section 40
Cc: InfoXD@mod.uk
Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-08-2007-151226-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your kind response. Would you be able to clarify the structure of a pertinent sentence

16/10/2007

your reply? You mentioned:

"[MoD is] not aware of investigations that"

The key word is 'investigations'. I believe my inquiry asked if there were any airspace violation incidents involving unknown objects (regardless of whether or not there was an accompanying investigation). Your response indeed clarified that there were no formal investigation into potential incidents, however, it did not address the core of my question, which was aimed to determine if any airspace violation incidents occurred in general.

If you can clarify whether or not unknown object airspace violation incidents have occurred in the first place, and the number of which that have occurred in recent history, I would appreciate that. You have already established there were no formal investigations, so I will not expect to receive documentation to that effect, but I would expect to receive a lighter set of documentation that includes original (and dated) incident reports and any documentation that can speak to the number of unknown object airspace violations that have occurred, along with any preliminary investigative reports into these matters.

Thank You,

Section 40

On Oct 15, 2007, at 6:43 AM, Section 40 wrote:

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 2 August 2007 which asked whether there were any incidents of unauthorised violation of airspace by an unknown object, whether such air activity was investigated and whether the investigation revealed whether any of the objects had entered UK airspace from outside the earths atmosphere.

Firstly, please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to you which was due to the need to consult with colleagues in the RAF Air Defence and Space Surveillance community, who are not aware of, and therefore do not hold any records of, any investigations that have identified an unauthorised violation of UK airspace by any unknown aerial object.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

16/10/2007

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 13 November 2007 09:45

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 16-10-2007-105758-002

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail of 21 October 2007 which requested I revisit my previous response to you of 16 October 2007.

Your Freedom of Information request of 15 October 2007 asked whether there had been any air space violation incidents involving unknown objects in *recent years*. The incident you refer to, details of which have already been made available to the public by this branch on the MoD website, took place some 14 years ago. Since it took place so long ago and has already been the subject of considerable speculation and debate amongst ufologists, I did not consider it in my response to you. However, if you can specify which time period you are interested in, I will look at your request again.

If you are still dissatisfied, then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB



Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 21 October 2007 21:51
To: Section 40
Cc: InfoXD@mod.uk; Section 40
Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 16-10-2007-105758-002

Dear Section 40

It is fascinating that with a simple 2-minute search I found a detailed MoD report involving a violation of UK air space by an unknown object:

http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/7AB48599-74BC-4AA9-8228-C98A33D68197/0/cosford_mar93_pt1.pdf

This is in direct conflict with your official response to my inquiry in which you stated that the MoD has 'no record of air space violations by unknown objects'.

I think this example makes it extremely probable that the MoD does indeed possess reports containing detailed information on numerous incidents of air space violations by unknown objects. Under what basis can you state there are 'no' records of airspace violations when in fact you've released at least one record already, and under what basis can you continue to mislead the public to the true nature of what is occurring in the skies overhead?

I kindly ask again that you perform a proper search and return the requested information in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Section 40

On Oct 16, 2007, at 10:53 AM, Section 40 wrote:

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 15 October 2007 asking whether in recent years there were any air space violation incidents involving unknown objects.

The MoD has no record of any such incidents.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you

22/10/2007

may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 15 October 2007 11:44

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-08-2007-151226-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 2 August 2007 which asked whether there were any incidents of unauthorised violation of airspace by an unknown object, whether such air activity was investigated and whether the investigation revealed whether any of the objects had entered UK airspace from outside the earth's atmosphere.

Firstly, please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to you which was due to the need to consult with colleagues in the RAF Air Defence and Space Surveillance community, who are not aware of, and therefore do not hold any records of, any investigations that have identified an unauthorised violation of UK airspace by any unknown aerial object.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

15/10/2007

06-08-2007-151226-003

exp 31 Aug 07

Section 40

From: **Section 40**
Sent: 02 August 2007 17:05
To: **Section 40**
Cc: **Section 40**
Subject: Re: RELEASE OF UFO FILES

Dear **Section 40**

Regarding today's news story:

<http://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/local-national/article2826498.ece>

"To date the MoD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

"The MoD examines any 'UFO' reports it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity.

"Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us."

The MoD states that no 'UFO' report has revealed a potential threat to the UK. However, the paragraph above that states the MoD investigates to determine whether the UFO represented "unauthorized air activity". Have there been cases where, even though there was no 'threat', there was indeed still an unauthorized violation of airspace by an unknown object? If such unauthorized air activity was investigated, did any of the investigations reveal objects that entered UK airspace from outside the earth's atmosphere? Please forward specific report information on these types of sightings if you have them.

Thank You,

Section 40

On Jun 28, 2007, at 11:31 AM, **Section 40** wrote:

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your kind and immediate response.

What I don't understand is that by stating that the matter is 'under discussion', you are clearly implying there is some past or present compelling need to keep the information secret. This does not reconcile in any way with public statements by the MoD that the UFO/UAP phenomenon are of 'no defense significance'. You did not state that the files weren't being released because they needed to be purged of privacy information. You stated 'the matter is under discussion', clearly inferring that there is something about the topic that requires continued secrecy.

At this point the only conclusion a sensible person can come to is that the MoD is lying to the public when it states that the phenomenon are of 'no defense significance'. I therefore would like to know from the top of your chain of command why the MoD

03/08/2007

views the population as a bunch of morons that deserve to be lied to?

Sincerely,

Section 40

On Jun 27, 2007, at 4:55 AM, Section 40 wrote:

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail (below) requesting the release of the MoD's UFO files. I can only refer you to my previous response and state that the matter is under discussion.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

From: Section 40
Sent: 26 June 2007 16:42
To: Section 40
Cc:
Subject: Re: RELEASE OF UFO FILES

Dear Section 40

The multiple news articles were very clear in indicating that the MoD was

most certainly going to release 24 DI55 files on the topic of UFOs & UAP in the coming weeks. Furthermore, the MoD has repeated on several occasions that UFOs are not of military concern. Therefore, what possible reason, safety or otherwise, could be used for withholding these documents any longer?

I request that the MoD release the entirety of its files on UFOs and UAP with no delay.

Thank You,

Section 40

MS Nuclear Engineering

On Jun 26, 2007, at 5:04 AM, **Section 40** wrote:

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your e-mail of 30 May 2007 regarding reports in the press that the Ministry of Defence (MoD) was planning to release all its UFO files to the public. It has been passed to this office to answer as we have lead responsibility within the MoD for UFO matters.

To date, contrary to any newspaper articles you may have seen, no decision has been taken to release all our UFO files, although the matter is under discussion. The MoD has however, already released much information on the subject of UFOs which can be found on our website www.mod.uk by searching under UFO.

Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to you.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI


05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB



AUTHORISATION TO WITHHOLD REQUESTED INFORMATION

Applicant: Section 40 [redacted]

Case Number: 09-10-2007-070245 -002 **Expiry:** 6 November 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Details of UFO reports from each London borough over the past three years.

Case for withholding information

Reports so far for 2007 that were asked for, will be placed on the website in January 2008.

Proposed use of the following FOI Exemptions

Exemption s.22 (information intended for future publication) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Section 40 [redacted]

12/10/07

Grade/Rank: Name:.....

Signature.....

Date:.....



From: **Section 40**
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

Section 40

Greenford
Middlesex

Section 40

Your Reference:

Our Reference:
09-10-2007-070245-002

Date:
12 October 2007

Dear **Section 40**

I am writing concerning your Freedom of Information asking for details of UFO reports from each London borough over the past three years. Your request has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to UFOs.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

With regard to your request, for sighting reports reported to the MOD from each London borough over the past three years, the Ministry of Defence has a database which contains this information, which covers details of reports from 1998 to 2006. The Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website can be accessed via the internet at:

<http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomofInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports.

Reports for the current year will be placed on the website in January 2008. Therefore, as provided by exemption s.22 (information intended for future publication) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The MOD is not obliged to comply with this part of your request.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives.

A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1986 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 08 October 2007 22:31
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 09-10-2007-070245-002 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Monday, October 8, 2007 at 22:30:42

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: Section 40

txtaddress1:

txtaddress2:

txttowncity: Greenford

txtstatecountry: Middlesex

txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: UK

txtinforequest: The number and location (where sighting were made) of each unidentified flying objects reported to the MOD in each London borough over the past 12 months.

If this takes so long as to incur costs on my behalf, please limit to the number in each London borough with the location only where each sighting was identified in the boroughs of Ealing and Hammermsith and Fulham for the past 12 months.

Also I would like the information above to cover a period of the past three years. Again if this will incur a cost on my behalf please limit to the scope outlined in the second paragraph.

Thanks

34

AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 06-08-2007-155401-0043 Expiry: 31 Aug 07

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Release of all photographs of UFOs held by the M oD.

Confirm contact was primary

Confirm it was a UK air defence matter

Case for release of information

Cost of release of photographs would exceed £600

No difficulty in release of other information.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the partial release of the aforementioned information subject to exemptions under FOI.

Grade/Rank: B1 Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05.....

Date: 11/10/07

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 11 October 2007 11:23
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-08-2007-155401-004

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 2 August 2007 asking the MoD to release all its copies of photographs of alleged UAP for the last sixty years. Additionally, you asked me to confirm that the alleged Alderney UFO sighting of 23 April 2007 was a UK air defence matter as it was some 10 miles NNE of Alderney.

If they are retained, (and they are often returned to owners) copies of UFO photographs etc are stored on our normal files, together with any sighting reports or correspondence, in the date order in which they are received. To comply with your request would require a manual search of those records, the cost of which would exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and, as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with the request. However, if you restricted your request to one or two specific years, we may be in a position to help.

It was generally the case that before 1967 all "UFO" files were destroyed after five years, as there was insufficient public interest in the subject to merit their permanent retention. However since 1967, following an increase in public interest in this subject "UFO" report files are now routinely preserved. Any files from the 1950s and early 1960s which did survive and those from 1967-84 are already available for examination by members of the public at the Public Record Office, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU.

The CAA documentation on this matter indeed states that the radar contact was a primary one. The MoD sees no requirement to contact them to confirm this.

The MoD is aware of the reported location of the sighting. This falls within an area of airspace for which French air traffic control have responsibility. We do not therefore consider this to be a UK air defence matter.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Finally, please accept my apologies for the amount of time it has taken to answer your question, which was due to volume of work. I should also like to thank you for your patience.

11/10/2007



Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

06-08-2007-155401-054

6 of 31 Aug 07

Section 40

From: Section 40
 Sent: 02 August 2007 16:42
 To: Section 40
 Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 17-07-2007-075648-001
 Attachments: 550788494-Alderney_27Apr07.doc

Dear Section 40

Thank you for the reply.

I have attached the official Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) database entries for the Alderney incident which specifically refer to the radar contact as a primary. Also the bearing has been stated as 10NNE which technically I think does make it a UK air defence matter.

I would be grateful if you could contact the CAA to cross validate the information I've supplied and once you've done this, let me know if you agree that this was a primary contact and it is indeed a UK air defence matter.

Finally, in the spirit of FoI, I would indeed be grateful if the MoD released all its photographs of unidentified aerial phenomena - ideally from the last sixty years.

Hope this is OK

Regards

Section 40

Section 40 > wrote:

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 17 July 2007 asking why the MoD response to FOI request 27-04-2007-080512-007 referred to the radar contact with the Alderney UAP sighting of 23 April 2007 as a secondary, when it was reported as a primary radar contact. Additionally, you asked why it was reported as being in French airspace when the Alderney constitution states that the UK is responsible for the islands defence matters. You went on to ask how many UAP sightings by pilots in the last 5 years have been backed up by primary radar contacts and finally, you asked if the MoD is going to release all its photographs of alleged UAP for public scrutiny.

In response to the first part of your question, I assume you are referring to an internal e-mail released with our response, suggesting that Jersey air traffic control did not have a primary radar capability. The longer range *area* radar system is indeed a secondary system. The Jersey Airport radar system, which has a shorter range, has both primary and secondary radar capability. I assume therefore, that the e-mail is referring to the longer range *area* radar.

The UK does retain responsibility for the defence of Alderney. That does not mean that it is necessary at this moment in time to place military radars there with the coverage necessary to have seen this UAP. The alleged incident occurred within an area of airspace that French air traffic control at Brest have overall responsibility for. This should not be confused with

03/08/2007

matters of sovereignty.

The MoD is not aware of any sighting reports made by pilots over the last five years that have been backed up by primary radar contacts.

The MoD has no plans at present to release all its photographs of alleged UAP incidents for public scrutiny. However, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, should any member of the public request photographs for a particular incident or time period, we will respond appropriately.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>
<<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H **Section 40**

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

PubRel

Date Printed : 03 August 2007

Safety Regulation Group Safety Investigation & Data Department

Aviation House
Gatwick Airport South
West Sussex
RH6 0YR

Direct Dial
Direct Fax
E-mail

Section 40

sdd@srg.caa.co.uk

Switchboard
Fax
Telex

01293 567171

Section 40

These records were retrieved from the UK CAA Mandatory Occurrence Reporting (MOR) system by a member of the SIDD Department

The MOR system records include information reported to the CAA, information obtained from CAA investigations, and deductions by CAA staff based on the available information. The authenticity of the contents or the absence of errors and omissions cannot be guaranteed. Records in this system commenced on 1 January 1976 coincident with the introduction of Mandatory Occurrence Reporting in the UK, but occurrences reported voluntarily are also included, and no distinction is made between them.

Note: Any data provided from these records are made available on the understanding that they are only to be used for purposes of Flight Safety and must not be used for other purposes.

A/C Type :	BN2a Trislander	Occurrence Number :	200703486
Flight Phase :	Cruise	Occurrence Date :	23 Apr 2007
Classification :	Occurrences	Location :	Alderney
Events :	Miscellaneous Non-AD Occurrence	Location Info :	10NNE

Pretitle :

BN2T crew observed a stationary bright light ahead, thought to be a reflection from the ground. However, crew viewed the light through binoculars and observed a shape, similar to a B737 fuselage.

Precis :

The crew contacted ATC, who originally stated that there wasn't anything showing on radar. However, they then observed a primary contact. The crew and some passengers observed the bright lights again later in the flight. The shape was said to be bright yellow with a dark area nearer to one end.

Note: Any data provided from these records are made available on the understanding that they are only to be used for purposes of Flight Safety and must not be used for other purposes.

03/08/2007

Section 40



From: Section 40

Sent: 11 October 2007 11:20

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 08-10-2007-105240-002

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail of 5 October clarifying your previous Freedom of Information request surrounding the recovery of a Soviet Venera 4 atmospheric probe, also known as Kosmos-96, in what is called the Kecksburg Incident. You state that this recovery occurred in 1967, but I believe that this may be a typing error on your part. If this is not the case, please let me know.

RAF Fylingdales has a record of the Kosmos-96 payload showing a "decay" date of 9 December 1965, although the time is unknown. Calculations based on orbital parameters for this object, show that even if it was still in orbit at the time of the incident (around 22:00), the orbital path was not crossing the USA. We have no record of any other satellites decaying on 9 December 1965.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

11/10/2007

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 05 October 2007 14:04

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 05-10-2007-071629-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail clarifying your request regarding the Kecksburg Incident. This incident is often described as a UFO incident, hence my erroneous assumption that your original request related to UFOs. I will try to track down the relevant branch to deal with the matter and will respond to you as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

05/10/2007

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 09 October 2007 11:08
To: Section 40
Cc: Section 40

Subject: Release-Authorised: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 05-10-2007-071629-003

Morning Section 40

Please see below the information we have on the events in question from 1965/67
Hope this will be of help in your FOI reply

Section 40

MCO Asst
RAF Fylingdales

Section 40

✉ Media Communications Office, RAF Fylingdales

☎ Section 40

✉ RAFMail: FYL Spt-MCOA

✉ E-Mail: mco@fylingdales.raf.mod.uk

From: FYL Ops-Strk Ldr
Sent: 09 October 2007 10:36
To: FYL Spt-MCOA
Subject: RE: Release-authorized: FW: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 05-10-2007-071629-003

Section 40

Hope that the following is of use to your MOD contact.

Note that item three is probably above and beyond the requirements of the FOI response but I include it for your interest.

1. We have no files or records relating to the Kecksburg Incident (although I am aware of the 1965 event).
2. Our records on the Cosmos 96 payload (SCC object 1742) show a "decay" date of 9 December 1965 (time unknown).
3. We have a set of orbital parameters for object 1742. Calculations using these parameters show that even if the object was still in orbit at the time of the reported incident (around 2200 Zulu) the orbital path was not crossing the US.
4. Our records indicate that no other satellites decayed on 9 December 1965.
5. We have no information relating to a Kecksburg incident in 1967.

Section 40

Serco Spacetrack Leader
Tel Section 40

From: FYL Spt-MCOA
Sent: 08 October 2007 14:57
To: FYL Ops-Strk Ldr
Subject: FW: Release-authorized: FW: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 05-10-2007-071629-003

Hi **Section 40**

This is the email traffic associated with the FOI request. Any info appreciated

cheers

Section 40

MCO Asst
RAF Fylingdales

Section 40

✉ Media Communications Office, RAF Fylingdales

☎ **Section 40**



RAFMail: FYL Spt-MCOA

E-Mail: mco@fylingdales.raf.mod.uk

From: **Section 40**

Sent: 08 October 2007 09:36

To: mco@fylingdales.raf.mod.uk

Subject: Release-authorized: FW: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 05-10-2007-071629-003

Section 40

Please find below the FOI request we spoke about. The original request was for all information held on the Kecksburg incident but has since been refined.

The original incident was December 1965 so I am not certain why he is now asking for information about 1967.

Can I therefore ask that you check both 1965 and 1967.

I suggest that it is best that I actually answer this question as I am already in correspondence with the requester - do you agree?

Section 40

DAS-FOI

Section 40

From: **Section 40**

Sent: 05 October 2007 13:44

To: **Section 40**

Subject: RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 05-10-2007-071629-003

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your email. My request re: the "Kecksburg Incident" relating to the recovery of the Soviet Venera 4 atmospheric probe, (also known as Kosmos-96, originally destined for Venus) by the US in 1967 is a

11/10/2007

rious query and no way related to a 'UFO X-file'.

Please process my freedom of information request.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40

Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 05-10-2007-071629-003

Date: Fri, 5 Oct 2007 09:31:46 +0100

From: Section 40

To: Section 40

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 4 October 2007 asking for any information the MoD holds on the "Kecksburg Incident" of 9 December 1965, in Pennsylvania, USA.

Given the length of time since the alleged incident, the Ministry of Defence no longer holds "UFO" files for the periods in question. Before 1967 all "UFO" files were destroyed after five years, as there was insufficient public interest in the subject to merit their permanent retention. However since 1967, following an increase in public interest in this subject, "UFO" report files are now routinely preserved. Files for 1967 to 1984, and any files prior to 1967 which did survive, are now available for examination at The National Archives, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU, Telephone: 0208 876 3444. Details of how to access these records and The National Archives on line catalogue can be found on their website at <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the internal process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

I am sorry I was unable to be of more help.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

11/10/2007

 .mail - das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Get free emoticon packs and customisation from Windows Live. [Pimp My Live!](#)



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 04-10-20074-085107-003 Expiry: 1 Nov 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Information on Roswell, Blue Book, aircraft accidents involving UFOs. Deaths involving UFOs and information on UFOs in UK and USA

Case for release of information

Request for information on UFOs in UK and USA withheld on cost basis.

MoD has no knowledge of deaths or aircraft accidents involving UFOs

Roswell and Blue book – referred to US authorities

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the partial release of the aforementioned information subject to exemptions under FOI.

Grade/Rank: B2 Name:..... **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date:..... 5/10/07

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 05 October 2007 14:48

To: Section 40

Subject: release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 04-10-2007-085107-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 4 October asking for information regarding Blue Book, Roswell UFOs in the UK, UFOs in the USA, plane accidents caused by UFOs and Deaths caused by UFOs.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

With regard to your request for UFO reports/information relating to UFOs in the UK I should inform you that MOD records are filed in the order in which they are received and we currently hold records spanning a 25 year period. To provide you with all the information you have requested would far exceed the permitted £600 cost limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, and as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request. However, the Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website has a database which contains UFO sighting reports for the last 9 years, and this can be accessed via the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports. However, if you could limit your request to a specific topic over a short period of time (perhaps a year) I may be able to help you.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information

05/10/2007

Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

EW 1 NOV 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 04 October 2007 09:08

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request PS 04-10-2007-085107-003 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on
Thursday, October 4, 2007 at 09:07:52

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtorganisation: HTI Research Institute of Space Flight

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2: -----

txttowncity: Braunschweig

txtstatecountry: BW/schwäbisch hall


txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: Germany

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: I need Informations about:

- Blue Book
 - Roswell
 - Ufo in GB
 - Ufo in USA
 - Plane accidents through UFO's
 - Deaths through UFO's
 - and many other
-



Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 05 October 2007 11:38
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-authorized: U 20070925 Section 40 FOI Buccaneer MAAS

Section 40

Greenham
Newbury
Berkshire

Section 40

5 October 2007

Our Reference: 27-09-2007-132239-007

Dear Section 40

I am responding to your Request for Information about Military Aircraft Accident Summaries relating to the Buccaneer.

You wrote asking if you could use the Military Aircraft Accident Summaries (MAAS) for Buccaneers XV345 and XN976 on your website with credit given to the MoD. You also asked whether it was possible to find further MAAS for the Buccaneer for the period 1958 to 1994.

I should explain that MAAS have been produced since 1979 as a way of advising first Parliament, and then, as required, the public, of the findings of Boards of Inquiry into aircraft accidents. We have now placed all the MAAS we have been able to trace into the MoD Publication scheme on the MoD website, and they can be found by following this link : <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/AboutDefence/WhatWeDo/AirSafetyandAviation/Military>

As regards MAAS for Buccaneers, we have been able to identify the following 9 since 1979 (as explained above there no earlier MAAS) (the date in each case is that of the accident.)

XV 345 7 February 1980

XW 537 23 September 1981

XX 898 17 June 1982

XV 160 20 September 1982

XX 891 11 August 1983

XZ 430 20 May 1984

XV 431 14 June 1985

05/10/2007

XW 540 22 April 1987

XN 976 9 July 1992.

Obviously you were aware of the first and last of these; all of them are on the MoD website (as PDF).

We are quite happy for these to be made available to the public, hence our placing them on the Internet, but we would suggest that instead of your reproducing them on your website, you post links to the MoD site, either to the general area, or to each individual report.

I hope that the above will be useful to you.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Directorate of Air Staff Secretariat
5.H. ~~Section 40~~ Main Building
Ministry of Defence
Whitehall
LONDON
SW1A 2HB
Tel ~~Section 40~~

27-09-2007-132279-007
EXP 23 04 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 24 September 2007 20:42
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Monday,
September 24, 2007 at 20:41:37

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: [REDACTED]

txtorganisation: Section 40

txtaddress1: Section 40

txtaddress2: Greenham

txttowncity: Newbury

txtstatecountry: Berkshire

txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: Section 40

txttelephone: Section 40

txtinforequest: Hello, please let me introduce myself, my name is Section 40
Section 40 and I am the Project Coordinator for the Section 40
Section 40

I would like to know whether it is possible to obtain permission to use
two of the Military Aircraft Accident Summarises on Buccaneer XV345 &
XN976 on our own website, with suitable creditation to the MOD.

I would also like to know if it is at all possible to find further
MAAS' that involved Buccaneer aircraft from 1958 to 1994.

All the best and I look forwards to hearing from you.

Best regards

Section 40
Projects Coordinator

Section 40



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 05 October 2007 09:32

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 05-10-2007-071629-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 4 October 2007 asking for any information the MoD holds on the "Kecksburg Incident" of 9 December 1965, in Pennsylvania, USA.

Given the length of time since the alleged incident, the Ministry of Defence no longer holds "UFO" files for the periods in question. Before 1967 all "UFO" files were destroyed after five years, as there was insufficient public interest in the subject to merit their permanent retention. However since 1967, following an increase in public interest in this subject, "UFO" report files are now routinely preserved. Files for 1967 to 1984, and any files prior to 1967 which did survive, are now available for examination at The National Archives, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU, Telephone: 0208 876 3444. Details of how to access these records and The National Archives on line catalogue can be found on their website at <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the internal process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

I am sorry I was unable to be of more help.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Follow up question:

08-10-2007-105240-002

05/10/2007

GN 2 NOV 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 04 October 2007 22:06

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request PS 05-10-2007-071629-003 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on
Thursday, October 4, 2007 at 22:06:23

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2: **Section 40**

txttowncity: Barnard Castle


txtstatecountry: Durham

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: I request any information held in the Mod's files
regarding the "Kecksburg Incident" of Kecksburg, Pennsylvania, USA
occurring on December 9, 1965. It was generally assumed and reported by
the US press to be a meteor - now thought to be part of the failed
Russian Cosmos #96 Venus probe.



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 02 October 2007 10:00

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 02-10-2007-072448-001

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 1 October 2007 asking for a copy of the Irish Defence Force UFO file.

The MoD does not have a copy of this file, which will be the property of the Irish Department of Defence. I suggest that you contact them at the following address:

Section 40

Department of Defence,

Parkgate,

Infirmity Road,

Dublin 7

Email: foi@defence.irlgov.ie

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the internal process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

I am sorry I was unable to be of more help.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

02/10/2007

EXP 30 OCT 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 01 October 2007 20:53
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 02-10-2007-072448-001 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Monday, October 1, 2007 at 20:53:06

txttitle: **Section 40**
txtfirstname: **Section 40**
txtlastname: **Section 40**
txtaddress1: **Section 40**
txtaddress2: Scholar Green
txttowncity: Stoke-On-Trent
txtstatecountry: Staffordshire
txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**
txtcountry: UK
txtemailAddress: **Section 40**
txttelephone: **Section 40**
txtinforequest: Dear Sir/Madam,

I am interested in knowing if it would be possible for me to acquire a copy of the Irish Defence Force's UFO file, or the contact details of where I could obtain the document, which was recently released, and also covered in an article in The Irish Times, dated Thursday 20th September, 2007. As I understand, the document contains such items as press clippings, classified memos and other such information.

The URL below is to the referenced article.

[<http://www.ireland.com/newspaper/frontpage/2007/0920/1190238990654.htm>
1]

I would be more than willing to pay any costs that might arise through this request, so if you could supply me with any details concerning this enquiry, I would be most grateful as I know you are busy. Also, could you please keep me informed of the cost if it rises above 50 pounds.

Many thanks,

Section 40



From: **Section 40**

**Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE**

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk

28

Section 40

Welton
Brough
East Riding of Yorkshire

Section 40

Our Reference

21-09-2007-065643-001

Date

25 September 2007

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 20 September 2007 asking whether UFO's exist and what the government is doing about them.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

The Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorized foreign military activity.

Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external military source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

The MOD does not study or research the phenomena of "UFOs". It is outside the Department's defence remit to devote resources to determining the precise identity of every seemingly inexplicable sight in the sky or the existence of extraterrestrials.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please

note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the internal process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Tom Womersley

Section 40



EXP 19 OCT 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 20 September 2007 20:48

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request PS 21-09-2007-065643-001 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on
Thursday, September 20, 2007 at 20:47:32

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtoccupation: N/A

txtorganisation: N/A

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2: Welton

txttowncity: Brough

txtstatecountry: East Riding of Yorkshire

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: I just want to know that if ufo's actually exist then what is the government doing about them because from what i've seen you are only concerned if they are a risk to national security so if thats the case do you think they come from another country or another planet? And if its half and half then why not undertake some research into the ones from other planets as they may have the technology to help sort out the worlds problems.

thanks

Section 40

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 25 September 2007 10:07

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 25-09-2007-065850-005

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 22 September 2007 asking if the Ministry of Defence had any plans for dealing with hostile alien contact and whether any plans for first contact had been drawn up with other nations.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena. We therefore have no plans relating to first contact and have not drawn up any plans in concert with other nations.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the internal process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

EX 22 OCT 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 22 September 2007 21:20

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request PS 25-09-2007-065850-005 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Saturday, September 22, 2007 at 21:20:07

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtoccupation: Operations Supervisor

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2: St Leonards

txttowncity: Exeter

txtstatecountry: Devon

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txttelephone: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: Dear Sir / Madam,


I am very interested in the Ministry of Defence's contingency for dealing with potentially hostile contact from extra terrestrial sources. In particular, if plans have been drawn up with other nations and what first contact procedures have been agreed upon should such events occur.

I request this information in all seriousness, as it is my sincere hope that humanity finds a peaceful solution for its problems, and that our governments are properly equipped to welcome enlightenment and help from outside sources. However, should a hostile species make contact, it would give me peace of mind to know that the leaders of the world are equipped for the consequences.

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 19 September 2007 15:06

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 13-09-2007-070207-002

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 12 September 2007 asking for a hard copy of all documents pertaining to UFOs and all paranormal activity. Your request has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFOs.' Additionally, you requested access to the MoD's official files.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

Turning to your request for copies of all documentation on the subject of UFOs and paranormal activity, I should inform you that most UFO records are not held electronically, but are filed on paper files in the order in which they are received and we currently hold records spanning a quarter of a century. The cost of complying with your request would exceed the permitted £600 cost limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, and as provided by Section 12 of the Act, therefore, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request.

However, you may wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs, together with a report into its study on Remote Viewing which is available on our website at www.mod.uk. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the internal process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on

19/09/2007

the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Finally, I must inform you that I am unable to provide you with personal access to the MoD's files.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information
5th Floor, Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 12 September 2007 20:59

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request PS 13-09-2007-070207-002 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on
Wednesday, September 12, 2007 at 20:59:22

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2: WEEDSWOOD

txttowncity: CHATHAM

txtstatecountry: KENT

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txttelephone: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: I WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST A HARD COPY OF ALL DOCUMENTS
PERTAINING TO UFO'S AND ALL PARANORMAL ACTIVITIES INVESTIGATED BY THE
MOD FOR RESEARCH PURPOSE'S IF THIS IS POSSIBLE IT WOULD BE MOST
APPRECIATED IF NOT THEN ACCESS TO THE OFFICIAL FILES WOULD BE HELPFUL.



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 17 September 2007 13:01

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 17-09-2007-120401-004

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 15 September 2007 asking whether the MoD has files on all UFO contacts with the military or civilians. Additionally, you asked if details of all contacts from 1900 onwards are available on-line or by CD.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

The Ministry of Defence does not have files on UFOs dating back to 1900 since, to the best of my knowledge, official interest in the subject only commenced after World War Two. The MOD holds files on the subject of UFOs dating back to the late 1970s.

In the meantime you may wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>. The Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website also contains some released information on UFOs. This can be accessed via the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>. Details of UFO sightings reported to the Mod for the period 1998-2006 are also available on the MOD website by searching under "UFO Reports". Details for 2007 will be released in January 2008.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with the response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can

17/09/2007

be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information
5th Floor, Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 15 September 2007 10:31

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request 17-09-2007-120401-004 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Saturday, September 15, 2007 at 10:31:23

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: [REDACTED]

txtoccupation: IT

txtaddress1: Section 40

txtaddress2: [REDACTED]

txttowncity: havant

txtstatecountry: hampshire

txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: Section 40

txttelephone: Section 40

txtinforequest: I was wandering if the MOD have on file all UFO contacts with the Military covering all Services or with Civilians.

Is there an MOD URL that I can go to online where there is details of all UFO encounters since 1900 or encounters with UFO's by witnesses in written reports. If you don't have an URL could you send all details on a CD for Operating System WiN.98SE.

One of the most interesting reports should also include the Triangle Craft (5 times the size of a Stealth Plane) seen over the North of England & Atlantic amd Mainland Europe in 1991 and reported by the Belgium Airforce in a Press Conference.

Many thanks

Section 40



FOI REQUEST 22-08-2007-174215-006

Crash of Phantom XV434 7 Jan 1986

Non UFO request. Transferred to File D/DAS/10/2/8/15 Part A Enc 1



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 12-09-2007-145438-012 Expiry: 9 Oct 07

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Details of UFO sightings in Southwark, Lambeth, Lewisham and Greenwich over the last 5 years.

Case for release of information

Details of UFO sightings are available on the MoD website for the period 1998-2006.

Details for 2007 will be published in January 2007 so are withheld under exemption s.22

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation not to release the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: **B2** Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date: **13/9/07**

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 13 September 2007 09:46

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 12-09-2007-145438-012

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 12 September 2007 asking for numbers and details of UFO sightings in Southwark, Lambeth, Lewisham and Greenwich.

Firstly, it may be helpful if I explain the role of the Ministry of Defence regarding UFO sightings. The Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorized foreign military activity.

Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external military source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

Details of UFO sightings for the period 1998-2006 can be found on the MoD website at www.mod.uk by searching under the term "UFO Reports". Details for 2007 will also be placed on the website in January 2008 and this information is therefore withheld under exemption s.22 (Information intended for Future Publication) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

In the meantime, you may wish to be aware that there is some information about UFOs available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and together with records up to 1977 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

I am sorry I could not be of more assistance.

13/09/2007

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 12 September 2007 14:51

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request 12-09-2007-145438-012 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on
Wednesday, September 12, 2007 at 14:51:00

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2: London

txttowncity: London

txtstatecountry: London

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txttelephone: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: I would like information on how many UFO sightings
there have been in the areas of Southwark, Lambeth, Lewisham and
Greenwich respectively in the last five years.

I would like to know how many UFO sightings there have been, but also
any details of the sightings. For example, where specifically they were
seen, how many reports of each UFO, what action was taken by the MoD
and whether you identified what the UFO was.

Please let me know and please confirm receipt of this email.

Many thanks

Section 40



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 11 September 2007 09:19

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-09-2007-064728-002 - RENDLESHAM

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request asking for full disclosure on what has become known as the Rendlesham Incident in 1980.

When the Ministry of Defence was informed of the events which are alleged to have occurred at Rendlesham Forest/RAF Woodbridge in December 1980, all available substantiated evidence was looked at in the usual manner by those within the MoD/RAF with responsibility for air defence matters. The judgement was that there was no indication that a breach of the United Kingdom's air defences had occurred on the nights in question. As there was no evidence to substantiate an event of defence concern, no further investigation into the matter was necessary. Although a number of allegations have subsequently been made about these reported events, nothing has emerged over the last quarter of a century which has given us reason to believe that the original assessment made by this Department was incorrect. The MoD file on the matter is available for viewing at www.mod.uk by searching under the word Rendlesham.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 05 September 2007 23:04

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request PS 06-09-2007-064728-002 **Section 40**

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on
Wednesday, September 5, 2007 at 23:04:24

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40**

txtlastname: **Section 40**

txtoccupation: BANK OFFICIAL

txtorganisation: N/A

txtaddress1: **Section 40**

txtaddress2: **Section 40**

txttowncity: BELFAST

txtstatecountry: DOWB

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: **Section 40**

txtinforequest: Under the FOI act i would like to request full
disclosure on an incident that occurred 27 years ago at: BENTWATERS,
WOODBRIDGE NATO AIRFORCE BASE, EAST ANGLIA

Witnessed by a several workers at this base including a security
Specialist named Larry Warren who was assigned to the base at this
time.

The person named above was in charge ''OF THE STORAGE OF NUCLEAR
WEAPONS WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PEOPLE OF GB''

At the time of this he was subjected to a 3 night UFO event at this
base, where-by UFOS ''MADE INCURSIONS OVER THEIR WSA, ALSO SENT BEAMS
OF LIGHT INTO THEM & ADVERSLY AFFECTED THE ORDIMENTS''

''THE OBJECTS WHERE ON THE GROUND ON 2 DIFFERENT NIGHTS, POTENTIALLY AN
EXTRA TERRESTRIAL SEEN''

''THESE EVENTS WHERE OF EXTREME SIGNIFICANCE TO HER MAJESTIES GOV AND
THE US GOVERNMENT''

I would like to request all reports and documented information regarding the above incident.


There was also a memo made from LFT COLONEL CHARLES HOLT who was the DEPT BASED COMMANDER at this time, of which again i would like to see full disclosure of this memo.

There was also an on sight audio feed that night and if possible to request this information media also.

Mr Warren has testified to US Congress under oath and has stated that this case has been kept from the UK citizens of which i would like full disclosure on, All comments that have quotes have came directly from Mr Warren regarding the incidents at Bentwaters Nato Base.

A full video of his disclosure can be supplied if you need further evidence of someone working under Her Majesty's service when this incident happened.

Thank you for your co-operation.



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant **Section 40**

Case Number: 06-09-2007-064312-001 Expiry: 3 Oct 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

All information on UFO sightings in Scotland 2006-07.

Files on named UFO sighting reports in same period

Case for release of information

Information for sightings is readily available on the MoD website so should be withheld under exemption s.21. Information for 2007 will be placed on the website in January 2008 so is withheld under exemption s.22.

The MoD does not have separate files on the named incidents.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information from the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: **B2** Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05 **Section 40**

Date: **10/9/07**

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 10 September 2007 10:44

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-09-2007-064312-001

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request dated 6 September 2007 asking for information relating to all UFO cases in Scotland for the period 2006-07.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is any evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

Your request also refers to files relating to specific sighting reports. The MoD does not generally open separate files on individual incidents (and has not done so for any on the incidents you mention) but places all reports, regardless of geographical location, on the same file. Information regarding sightings for 2006 and other UFO matters is readily available on the MoD website www.mod.uk and therefore under exemption s.21 (Information reasonably accessible by other means) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 the MoD is not required to provide you the information you requested. Details of the sightings for 2007 will be published on the MoD website in January 2008 and therefore are withheld under exemption s.22 (Information intended for future publication).

In the meantime, you may wish to be aware that there is some information about UFOs available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and together with records up to 1977 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>

10/09/2007

<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

I am sorry I could not be of more assistance.

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 06 September 2007 06:44
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 06-09-2007-064312-001 Section 40

Section 40

Can I interest you with this FOI request?

Regards

Section 40
FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 06 September 2007 00:45
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 06-09-2007-064312-001 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Thursday, September 6, 2007 at 00:44:45

txttitle: Section 40
txtfirstname: Section 40
txtlastname:
txtorganisation: East 2 West UFO Society
txtaddress1: Section 40
txtaddress2:
txttowncity: Glasgow
txtstatecountry: Lanarkshire
txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40
txtcountry: UK
txtemailAddress: Section 40
txtinforequest: Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to make a request for information relating to all UFO cases for Scotland made in the year 2006/2007 as I read in a local newspaper (Airdrie & Coatbridge Advertiser) that these files are available under the FOI.

21 February 2006, Unknown, Scotland
18 March 2006, West Kilbride, Ayrshire
23 April 2006, West Kilbride, Ayrshire
04 July 2006, Locherbridges, Dumfries
20 July 2006, Johnston, Paisley
29 September 2006, East Linton, East Lothian
01 November 2006, Ayr, Ayrshire
29 November 2006, Coatbridge, Nr Glasgow

No Firm Date, (According to MOD PDF File on website the Message taken 10 January 2006), Bony Lake, Mid Lothian.

(I am looking for 2 files relating to the above report, One is of 5 orange lights


that were quite bright moving slowly across the sky. The other was of 4 small bright
re lights moving slowly across the sky both were reported on the same evening)

No Firm Date, Midlothian, Scotland (According to MOD PDF File on website the object
was seen sometime in December 2006, Message taken 04 January 2007),

Many Thanks

Section 40

East 2 West UFO Society



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 07-08-2007-082541-001 Expiry: 05 Sep 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Clarification of previous response

Copies of correspondence to MoD on subject of crop circles file over last two years.

Case for release of information

Relevant extracts have been provided.

Names, addresses etc of individuals have been redacted under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) Freedom Information Act.

Additionally, 5 e-mails have been withheld in full as their contents clearly identify the original correspondent or a specific individual member of the public.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the release of the aforementioned information subject to exemptions under FOI.

Grade/Rank: BI Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05.....

Date: 4.9.2007

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 04 September 2007 13:04
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 07-08-2007-082541-001
Attachments: Annex to 07-08-2007-082541-001.doc

Dear Section 40

1. Thank you for your e-mail of 6 August 2007. You asked for clarification of a number of points made in my response to your **FOI request Ref: 23-07020070143005-004**.
2. You asked specifically for copies of correspondence from a named individual, Section 40. This information is personal to Section 40. When a request is made for information, and MOD then considers the information for disclosure, care is taken to ensure that all third party personal data is redacted or withheld where appropriate. In your e-mail you have suggested that there is no reason that correspondence from members of the public to MOD should not be made available to the public in general. This is not the case, personal information must be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The Freedom of Information Act (the Act) provides access to recorded information held by a public authority at the time a request is made. The authority has an obligation to provide this information unless it is exempt from disclosure by virtue of an exemption under the Act. Section 40 of the Act provides for the protection of personal data.
3. Section 40(3)(a) of the FOI Act states that where information falls within the definition of "data" in DPA 98, and "the disclosure of the information to a member of the public otherwise than under this Act would contravene-
 - i. Any of the data protection principles, or
 - ii. Section 10 of DPA 98 (right to prevent processing likely to cause damage or distress)"

this information is exempt from disclosure.

4. Furthermore, the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), Article 8, provides that everyone has the right to respect for his/her private and family life. The purpose of DPA 98 is to protect personal data, and to ensure that the processing of any such data (or, to put it in straightforward terms, the use of such information), is carried out in accordance with the Act. Personal data is defined as data which relates to a living individual who can be identified from that data. The protection afforded by DPA98 is not an excuse to withhold information, but any disclosure must comply with the provisions set out in the Act. The data protection principles state that personal data must be processed fairly and lawfully, and not processed in any manner incompatible with the purpose for which it was obtained.

5. All recorded information held by a public authority is subject to the Act, and where the MoD considers that information is personal and therefore covered by exemption s.40, it will be withheld. A letter written to the MoD by a member of the public would contain personal information such as their name or address and any response to that letter is considered as personal to the individual concerned. That having been said, where an member off the publics letter is considered to be a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act, any resulting *information* released is considered to have become into the public domain and a disclosure to the wider public. This information is not considered personal.

04/09/2007

6. The transfer of files to The National Archives (TNA) is handled under the Public Records Act (PRA). Public records selected for permanent preservation are selected because there is a strong public interest in preserving this information. The balance of public interest in respect of any exemptions used under the FOI Act to withhold information will be considered at the time of transfer to TNA. In respect of personal information and information provided in confidence in some case it may be that any duty of confidence will have diminished over the period of 20 to 30 years, in other cases the duty of confidence will remain strong and therefore the information will be withheld. There may also be other exemptions that apply to the information.
7. In summary, when a member of the public writes to MOD they would not expect their letter to be either published or disclosed to another member of the public, and any reply from MOD is treated as personal to that individual. The individual would expect the MOD to retain the confidence of the originator, unless they have provided their consent to release. When MOD provides a copy of a response to an FOI request it is the recorded information subject to the request that is released, or the explanation of why the information was not disclosed— not the identity of the person who asked for it, or irrelevant details of their correspondence. Over time the balance of public interest in withholding information may change and this will be considered in the light of the prevailing circumstances.
8. In your e-mail of 17 July 2007 you asked if I could offer any thoughts as to why **Section 40** aims to have opened a file- it was to this question that I replied that it would not be appropriate for me to speculate on the motives of a member of the public in any statement that they make.
9. As to your new request for copies of any correspondence to the MOD within the last two years from anyone which deals with the matter of crop circles and whether or not the MOD holds files on crop circles, MOD does hold information relevant to your request, extracts of which are attached to this e-mail. However names, addresses and any information that could be used to identify the correspondent have been withheld under exemption s.40 of the Act for the reasons that I have explained above. Additionally, five e-mails have been withheld in full on the same basis.
10. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.
11. If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

**EXTRACTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE ON THE SUBJECT OF A
CROP CIRCLE FILE**

FOI request received 17 November 2006

I would like to see a copy of the file that was opened on crop circles [REDACTED] between the years of 1991-94. I have searched the MoD website for any information on crop circles and have not found any. I would like to know if it would be possible to purchase this file that was opened on crop circles but then subsequently closed.

FOI Request dated 17 December 2006

I would like to request under the Freedom of information act the file [REDACTED] opened on crop circles [REDACTED] between 1991 and 1994.

FOI request received 19 December 2006

Further to speaking with [REDACTED] again regarding the file [REDACTED] on crop circles I would like to make a final request for information from the MoD. The file was opened somewhere in the period 1991 to 1994 [REDACTED]. The file was simply called "Crop Circles" and was in the 12 series of files, ie the reference began "D/Sec(AS)/12".

Please can you locate this file for me? What does it contain and when exactly was it opened?

E-mail received 2 August 2007

Please send me any information about the title and content of files D/Sec(AS)/12/6 from the file lists, from the PQ background not I mentioned, or from any other source – I think this will resolve the mystery and help clear up any misunderstandings.

I hope this is helpful and assists you in tracking down what I still believe is a discrete file on crop circles that has gone missing.

WITHHELD IN FULL

E-mail dated 20 December 2006

E-mail dated 19 January 2007

E-mail dated 23 July 2007

E-mail dated 6 August 2007

E-mail dated 6 August 2007

07-08-2007-082541-001
EXP 5 Sep 07

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 06 August 2007 20:24

To: Section 40

Subject: Fw: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 23-07-2007-143005-004

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your response, the nature of which has left me somewhat confused. To that end I am querying a few of your statements, to which I would appreciate answers, and refining the nature of my question.

>Any correspondence between a named member of the public such as Section 40 or indeed yourself, remains a confidential >matter between the individual and the MoD and is withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information).

Yet this is clearly not the case. If I applied for details of a specific UFO file the MOD would send me that file. If that file contained letter/s from members of the public those letters would be included in the copied file. As I was making a specific FOI request concerning crop circles and happened to know the name of the individual who *claimed* to have written to you I would like to know how this request differs from the request for a specific file?

Surely had Section 40 or indeed anyone else - written to you about a crop circle file (which you may or may not hold) then this would be placed in a file and would, at some point, appear in TNA. Therefore, now we no longer have to wait for time periods to expire before we can see the majority of MOD files, there is no reason why any such correspondence, redacted or otherwise, should not be made available to members of the public.

>I would point out, that if Section 40 were to ask for copies of any correspondence between yourself and the MoD, the same >would apply.

Not so. If it was concerned with UFOs or related matters, as Section 40's alleged his was, then my letter would be in a file which could be requested and seen by Section 40. I think you are intentionally obfuscating the matter here Section 40

>It would not be appropriate for me to speculate on the motives of a member of the public in any statement that they make >during the course of their private or business life.

At no time have I asked you to speculate on the motives of a member of the public, as well you know. I have merely requested information as to whether you hold correspondence on the subject matter in question. Your response does not answer that question....

>You have asked me to review my response to Freedom of Information request 16-07-2007-074214-001 in light of >comments made by Section 40 a recent magazine article. I can only state that the MoD has no record of a file on crop >circles having been opened either prior to, during, or after, the period 1993-94.

I would, as a result of your response, like to refine my request further.

I am now requesting copies of any correspondence to the MOD within the last two years, from anyone, which deals with the matter of crop circles and whether or not the MOD holds files on crop circles. I am quite happy to have these letters redacted if you so wish.

07/08/2007

regards

Section 40



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 04-09-2007-111221-001 Expiry: 2 Oct 07

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

UFO/Flying Triangle sighting reports for Northern Ireland 2006-07

References to UFO, UAP, ASC and Flying Triangles

Case for release of information

Details for 2006 are available on the MoD website. Details for 2007 will be released in January 2007 so are currently withheld under exemption s.22

Cost of releasing all references to UFOs etc would exceed £600 so under Section 12 of the FOI Act MoD is not required to comply

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information from the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: Bl Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05.....

Date: 4.9.07



From: **Section 40**

Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000

e-mail

das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Section 40

Spanaway
Wa 98387
USA

Our Reference
04-09-2007-111221-001

Date
4 September 2007

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 25 August 2007 asking for sightings of UFOs and Flying Triangles from our Northern Ireland "dossier". Additionally, you asked for all references to the words UFO, UAP, ASC and Flying Triangles.

Firstly, I should explain that we do not have a Northern Ireland dossier as our records are not filed geographically. As I informed you in my letter of 23 May 2007, details of sightings over the UK for 2006 are available on the Ministry of Defence website at www.mod.uk by searching under "UFO Reports". Details of sightings for 2007 will be placed on the website in January 2008 and therefore are withheld under exemption s.22 (Information intended for Future Publication).

The cost of releasing all documents containing the words UFO, UAP, ASC and Flying triangles would exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with the request.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>> ."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40



Section 40

Spanaway, WA 98387

FOIA Unit M00, Section 40
FOIA Agency Address

04-09-2007-111221-02
EX/ 200707

Request under the Freedom of Information Act. Privacy Act. Aug 25 2007

This is a request for a complete search of all filing systems and locations for all records held by your agency relating to: *Ufo sightings over Northern Ireland Dossier*

insert details of the desired records, or describe in detail the event(s) for which you seek information. ufo sightings and Flying triangles sightings 2006, 2007 to date
including all documentation, including captions, that includes reference to:

insert possible alternative names and spellings, abbreviations, acronyms, etc.

I also request all "see references" to these names. *Ufo, UAP, ASC, Flying Triangle*

If the documents are denied in part or whole, please specify which exemptions are claimed for each passage or whole document denied. Please provide a complete itemized inventory and detailed factual justification of any denial. Specify the number of pages in each document and the total number of pages pertaining to this request. For classified material denied, please include the following information:

- the classification rating (confidential, secret, top secret, etc.)
- the identity of the classifier
- the date or event for automatic declassification or classification review

I request that censored material be 'blacked out' rather than 'whited out' or cut out. I expect that the remaining non-exempt portions of documents will be released.

Please send a memo to the appropriate units in your office or agency to assure that no records related to this request are destroyed (and please send a copy of the memo to me). Please advise of any destruction of records, and include the date and authority for such destruction.

As I expect to appeal against any denials, please specify the office and address to which an appeal should be directed.

I believe that my request qualifies for a waiver of fees as the release of the information would benefit the general public and be in the public interest.

I can be reached at the telephone number listed above. Please call rather than write if there are any questions or if you need additional information from me.

I expect a response to this request within ~~30~~ working days, as provided for in the Freedom of Information Act.

Sincerely, etc

Section 40

DATE 3 SEP 1977

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 28 August 2007 13:48

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FRREDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 28-08-2007-175604-010

Dear Section 40

Thank you for Freedom of Information request of 25 August 2007 regarding the availability of the Rendlesham Forest file on the MoD website. I attach a link that should work:

<http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme/SearchPublicationScheme>

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>
<<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 28 August 2007 08:33
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 28-08-2007-075604-010 Section 40

Section 40

Can I interest you with this FOI request?

Regards

Section 40
FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 25 August 2007 14:45
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 28-08-2007-075604-010 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Saturday, August 25, 2007 at 14:45:30

txttitle: Section 40
txtfirstname: Section 40
txtlastname: Section 40
txtaddress1: Section 40
txtaddress2: *
txttowncity: LE PERREUX SUR MARNE
txtstatecountry: FRANCE
txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40
txtcountry: France
txtemailAddress: Section 40
txtinforequest: Dear sir,


i write this mail just to ask you where I could find the following document named "Unidentified Flying Objects: Rendlesham Forest Incident 1980".

This document doesn't seems to be available again here, but there are some links about it there :

<http://www.nidsci.org/articles/articles1.php> =>
http://www.mod.uk/linked_files/publications/foi/ufo/ufofilepart1.pdf
http://www.mod.uk/linked_files/publications/foi/ufo/ufofilepart2.pdf
http://www.mod.uk/linked_files/publications/foi/ufo/ufofilepart3.pdf
http://www.mod.uk/linked_files/publications/foi/ufo/ufofilepart4.pdf
http://www.mod.uk/linked_files/publications/foi/ufo/ufofilepart5.pdf

Thank you a lot for your help.

Section 40



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant **Section 40**

Case Number: 23-08-2007-070328-001 Expiry: 21 Sep 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Where he can find a copy of the UAP report.

Can he read it in person.

Case for release of information

The information is withheld under exemption s.21 in that it is readily available on the MoD website

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to withhold the aforementioned information from Applicant.

Grade/Rank: **B2** Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05.... **Section 40**

Date:..... **24/9/07**



From: **Section 40**

Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Windermere
Cumbria

Section 40

Our Reference

23-08-2007-070328-001

Date

24 August 2007

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 23 August 2007 asking where you can locate a copy of the UAP in the UK Air Defence Region report. Additionally, you asked whether it would be possible to read the document in person.

As you are aware, the report is available on the Ministry of Defence internet site at www.mod.uk. It is therefore readily available for the public to read and under exemption s.21 (Information Reasonably Accessible to the Applicant by Other Means) the MoD is not required to provide you with a copy. I am afraid that it is not possible for you to read the report in person, by which I assume you mean you wish to visit and read the original document.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

I am sorry I could not be more helpful.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 23 August 2007 07:08
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 23-08-2007-070328-001 Section 40

Section 40

Can I interest you with this FOI request?

Regards

Section 40

FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 23 August 2007 00:51
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 23-08-2007-070328-001 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Thursday, August 23, 2007 at 00:51:03

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: [REDACTED]

txtaddress1: [REDACTED]

txtaddress2: [REDACTED]


txttowncity: Windermere

txtstatecountry: Cumbria

txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: UK

txtinforequest: I would like to know where i can find a copy of the 3 volume report titled "UAP in the UK Air Defence Region" I have recently discovered this report on the website but would like to be able to read the document in person. Is there any way i can do this?



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 21 August 2007 11:52

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-Authorised: FOI Request - 10-08-2007-101915-002

Dear Section 40

I am writing concerning your Freedom of Information request asking for UFO sighting reports in the London Borough of Croydon, since the Ministry of Defence started keeping records. Your request has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to UFOs.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

With regard to your request for UFO sighting reports from Croydon, since the Ministry of Defence started keeping records, I have checked my records for so far in 2007, and have found no sighting reports for this area. As to sighting reports since records began, I should inform you that MOD records are filed in the order in which they are received and we currently hold records spanning a 25 year period. They are not segregated by geographical area. To identify records specifically for the information from the area that you require, would require a manual search and the costs to do this would exceed the permitted £600 cost limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, and as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request. However, the Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website has a database which contains UFO sighting reports for the last 9 years, and this can be accessed via the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1
5th Floor, Zone H

21/08/2007

in Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Section 40

EX 7 JCB 07

From: Section 40
Sent: 10 August 2007 10:21
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request 10-08-2007-101915-002 Section 40

Categories: FOI Information Request

Section 40

I'll pass it on AIT.

Section 40

Info-AccessOps5

Section 40

Main Building

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 09 August 2007 15:51
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request 10-08-2007-101915-002 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Thursday, August 9, 2007 at 15:50:48

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: Section 40

txtoccupation: News Reporter

txtorganisation: Section 40

txtaddress1: Section 40

txtaddress2: Section 40

txttowncity: South Croydon

txtstatecountry: Surrey

txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: Section 40

txttelephone: Section 40

txtinforequest: Can you tell me about the UFO sightings in the London Borough of Croydon since the Ministry of Defence started keeping records? Could you detail the date and time of these sightings and explain what the sighting was?



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 16-08-2007-111650-002 Expiry: 10 Sep 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Details of UFO sightings at Shipston-on-Stour in 1999 and 2000.

Case for release of information

There is no reason to withhold the information. Names, addresses etc of individuals have been redacted under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) Freedom Information Act.

Although the information is available on line, on this occasion, hard copies have been provided.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the release of the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: **B2** Name: **Section 40**
Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05.... **Section 40**
Date: **20/11/07**



From: Section 40

Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000

e-mail

das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Section 40

Our Reference

16-08-2007-111650-002

Shipston-on-Stour
Warwickshire

Date

Section 40

15 August 2007

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 5 August 2007 asking for copies of two UFO sighting reports for Shipston-on-Stour in 1999 and 2000.

The information you require can be found on the MoD website at www.mod.uk by searching under UFO reports in the publication scheme. On this occasion, I am prepared to provide you with hard copies of the reports. However, in future you should contact your local public library which will have internet facilities available to you.

You will notice that personal details such as names, addresses and telephone numbers have been withheld under exemption s.40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website,

<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>> ."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

12/12/00

[REDACTED]
Sec (as) 2
M O D Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB

Dear sir,

We are enquiring regarding the following situation.

On Tuesday 28 November at 4.05am we noticed from our bedroom toilet window a stationary intermittent flashing yellow light some distance away in a South Easterly direction.

At one point there were three objects which appeared to be fixed in one position.

I went outside to acquire another angle but it was still there in the same position. In fact at 7.05 am I asked my grand daughter to have a look. Only one light was visible still in the same position, This morning at 12.30am we noticed one light in the same area again but not as bright as before and flashing less often.

Please can you confirm anything different on your radar screens and have any of your air crew seen these lights in our area.

If you take a line due South from Birmingham airport, it was seen 28 miles with an angle 6 miles East of the North to South line. It appeared roughly 30 degrees from our window. If you investigate further I can pinpoint the direction through the trees on our property.

We look forward to your reply.

Yours Sincerely [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

REPORT OF AN UNEXPLAINED AERIAL SIGHTING

150

1.	Date and time of sighting. (Duration of sighting.)	28 Jan 99
2.	Description of object. (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, noise.)	looked like an aeroplane (had wings but no propellers). It was silent with red + blue lights on it.
3.	Exact position of observer. (Indoors/outdoors, stationary/moving.)	Driving along A3400 at 20 mph
4.	How object was observed. (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, camera or camcorder.)	Naked eye
5.	Direction in which object was first seen. (A landmark may be more helpful than a roughly estimated bearing.)	hovering above tree tops
6.	Approximate distance.	
7.	Movements and speed. (side to side, up or down, constant, moving fast, slow)	
8.	Weather conditions during observation. (cloudy, haze, mist, clear)	

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

9.	To whom reported. (Police, military, press etc)	
10.	Name, address and telephone no of informant.	
11.	Other witnesses.	Her 3 children
12.	Remarks.	
13.	Date and time of receipt.	29.1.99 11AM (Answerphone)

16-W-2007-111655-002

EXP 10 SEP 07

5/8/07

DEAR SIR OR MADAM,

I HAVE WRITTEN TO YOU SEVERAL TIMES IN THE PAST, CONCERNING LOCAL UFO REPORTS, THE LAST TIME WAS ABOUT LOW FLYING AIRCRAFT, LETTER DATED THE 29 OCT. 2006, YOUR REF. D/DAS/06/11/41.

THE REASON I AM WRITING TODAY IS, WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE FOR ME TO HAVE PHOTO COPIES OF THE TWO UFO REPORTS (1999 + 2000) FROM SHIPSTON - ON - STOUR.

AS MENTIONED IN THE SUNDAY MERCURY AUGUST 5TH 2007, ON PAGES 14 + 15 IT SHOWS A 2 NEXT TO SHIPSTON - ON - STOUR ON A MAP OF UFO REPORTS IN THE MIDLANDS WHICH YOU HAVE RECEIVED FROM 1998 TO 2006. THE TWO REPORTS CANNOT BE ONE OF MINE AS MY LAST SIGHTING WAS IN 1996.

I DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO THE INTERNET, THAT IS WHY I'M HOPING YOU WOULD BE KIND ENOUGH TO PHOTOCOPY THEM FOR ME.

MANY THANKS

YOURS SINCERELY

Section 40

DAS
102No.....
10 AUG 2007
FILE.....



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant **Section 40**

Case Number: 10-08-2007-114308-005 Expiry: 10 Sep 2007

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Details of UFO sighting at Primrose Hill in June 1993 and supporting documentation.

Case for release of information

There is no reason to withhold the information. Names, addresses etc of individuals have been redacted under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) Freedom Information Act.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation for the release of the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: **B2** Name:..... **Section 40**
Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**
Date:..... **20/9/07**

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 20 August 2007 14:44
To: Section 40
Subject: Release-authorized: freedom of information request 10-08-2007-114308-005
Attachments: Primrose Hill Sighting.mdi

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 10 August 2007 asking for copies of any UFO reports for Primrose Hill in London during June 1993, together with related documentation.

I have located one UFO report which I attach. You will notice that names and personal details have been withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal information) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

You may wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after five years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>. The Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website also contains some released information on UFOs. This can be accessed the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under UFO reports.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

Paul Webb
DAS-FOI
05-H-Section 40
MoD Main Building
London
SW1A 2HB

20/08/2007

REPORT OF AN UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

45

<p>A. Date, Time & Duration of Sighting</p>	<p>Friday 4th June, 1.55 am - approx 2.10 am</p>
<p>B. Description of Object (No of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness)</p>	<p>Three objects, two of which "split into two" Almost conventional "flying saucer" shape, with flashing red + white lights.</p>
<p>C. Exact Position of Observer Location, indoor/outdoor, stationary/moving</p>	<p>On Primrose Hill, North London</p>
<p>D. How Observed (Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, still or movie)</p>	<p>Naked eye + binoculars</p>
<p>E. Direction in which Object first seen (A landmark may be more useful than a badly estimated bearing)</p>	<p>Approx NNW</p>
<p>F. Angle of Sight (Estimated heights are unreliable)</p>	<p>N/A. Height varied between 2000 ft - 14000 ft. v. approx estimates</p>
<p>G. Distance (By reference to a known landmark)</p>	<p>Sometimes v close, later - further away</p>
<p>H. Movements (Changes in E, F & G may be of more use than estimates of course and speed)</p>	<p>Objects moved wildly around: zig zapping, moving in spirals etc. At times, stationary</p>
<p>I. Met Conditions during Observations (Moving clouds, haze, mist etc)</p>	<p>Clearish night</p>
<p>J. Nearby Objects (Telephone lines, high Voltage lines, reservoir, lake or dam, swamp or marsh, river, high buildings, tall chimneys, steeples, spires, TV or radio masts, airfields, generating plant, factories, pits or other sites with floodlights or night lighting)</p>	<p>Built up area</p>

K. To whom reported (Police, military, press etc)	MOD (Duty Clerk / Air Force OPS ?) shortly after sighting. Later, to me.
L. Name & Address of Informant	[REDACTED]
M. Background of Informant that may be volunteered	[REDACTED] who has worked with [REDACTED] on conducting some of the claims work about regression hypnosis re alien abductions.
N. Other Witnesses	His friend, [REDACTED]
O. Date, Time of Receipt	Friday 4 th June, 9.45 am
P. Any Unusual Meteorological Conditions	None
Q. <u>Remarks</u>	Has always been sceptical of extraterrestrial explanation for UFOs. Believed object must have showed up on radar, and asked me to check.* v. well informed on ufology theories + personalities.

[REDACTED]

SEL (AS) 2a

* Note of Action.
Spoke to ASJ (M1) at RAF West Drayton.
They'll examine tapes and let me know if anything unusual shows up.

10-08-2007-114368-005

Section 40

6x8 10 SEP 07

From: Section 40
Sent: 10 August 2007 11:40
To: Section 40
Subject: UFO sightings copies

Hi Section 40 you please send me copies of any UFO sightin reports and related documents covering UFO sightings in London - Primrose Hill in June 1993. thank you. Section 40



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 20 August 2007 11:24

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 23-07-2007-104116-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 23 July 2007 asking for the status of file D/DS/8/75/2/1 Part G. You also asked what dates the file covered.

The file was transferred to The National Archive on 31 July 2007 and should be available for public viewing within the next few weeks. I am afraid that your request crossed with the file being sent off, and I am therefore unable to confirm the dates covered.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

I am sorry I could not be of more assistance.

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 23 July 2007 10:22
To: Section 40
Subject: TNA file on UFOs 1980

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your letter of 17 July and for the papers you sent in response to my FOI request dated 18 June.

If you recall in my letter I also asked about the status of a UFO file which I identified by the former reference 'D/DS8/75/2/1 Pt H UFO reports & correspondence 1980'.

This was a typographical mistake on my part; I was aware Pt H was at Kew and had reviewed its contents in March this year.

The file that was the actual subject of my inquiry is the preceding file in the sequence (Part G); this was the file I inquired about in my 1 February letter which you replied to on 16 February to say this file had been located (it had previously been 'missing' in the material supplied by your predecessor) and was being prepared for transfer to the national archives.

Can you confirm the status and dates covered by D/DS8/75/2/1 Pt G?

Many thanks,

Section 40



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 20-08-2007-065339-003 Expiry: 14 Sep 07

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Copies of pictures of UFOs for the period 1980-90

Case for release of information

The cost of providing this information would exceed £600 and therefore under Section 12 of the FOI Act MoD is not obliged to provide an answer.

Requester has been asked to narrow the scope of his request.

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation not to release the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: **B2** Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05..... **Section 40**

Date: **20/9/07**

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 20 August 2007 09:32

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 20-08-2007065339-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for Freedom of Information request of 18 August 2007 requesting copies of pictures purporting to be of Unidentified Flying Objects held by the MoD for the period 1980-1990.

You may wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after five years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>. The Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website also contains some released information on UFOs. This can be accessed the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under UFO reports.

If they are retained, (and they are often returned to owners) copies of UFO photographs etc are stored on our normal files, together with any sighting reports or correspondence, in the date order in which they are received. To comply with your request for the remaining period 1985-90 would require a manual search of those records, the cost of which would exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and, as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with the request. However, if you restricted your request to one specific year, we may be in a position to help.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

I am sorry I could not be of more assistance.

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

20/08/2007

5W1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 20 August 2007 06:55
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 20-08-2007-065339-003 Section 40

Section 40

Can I interest you with this FOI request?

Regards

Section 40

FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 18 August 2007 03:55
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 20-08-2007-065339-003 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Saturday, August 18, 2007 at 03:54:42

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: [REDACTED]

txtaddress1: [REDACTED]

txtaddress2: -----

txttowncity: Winsford

txtstatecountry: Cheshire

txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: Section 40

txtinforequest: The Information/Content i request is a hard copy of all the pictures held by the MOD on the subject of UFOs/Aliens from the 1980 to 1990 to be sent to the postal address, any attachment files should also be sent.

Thanks

Section 40



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 16 August 2007 15:34

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorised: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 09-085-2007-094616-002
ATTENTION Section 40

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of requesting details of UFO sightings over East Staffordshire since 1999.

The Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website contains details of UFO sightings reported to us for the period 1998-2006. This can be accessed the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under "UFO reports". Details for 2007 will be published early in the new year. However, so far this year, we have had no reports of any UFO sightings in East Staffordshire, although we have had one report for Stafford.

You also requested information held by the MoD regarding your request. I wrote to you on 10 August 2007 requesting clarification and await your reply.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

16/08/2007

EX 4/2/07

Uttoxeter ^{The} Advertiser

Telephone **Section 40** - Editorial
Telephone **Section 40** - Advertising
Fax: **Section 40**
Website: www.uttoxeteradvertiser.co.uk

RECEIVED ADMIN
06 08 2007
MAIN BLDG 6F

The Lion Buildings
8 Market Place
Uttoxeter
Staffordshire
ST14 8HP

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to request information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. In order to assist you with this request, I am outlining my query as specifically as possible.

I would like to know the details of all unexplained sightings (suspected UFOs) in East Staffordshire since 1999. I would like details of when they were spotted, by who and what they saw.

I would also like copies of the witness statements handed to the MoD.

I would like to request the information in a written reply, by email if possible.

I would be interested in any information held by your organisation regarding my request and considered relevant to my request.

If my request is denied in whole or part, I would kindly request that you explain all deletions by reference to the specific exemptions of the act.

I would be grateful if you could confirm in writing that you have received this request. If you have any queries about my request please don't hesitate to give me a call on **Section 40**

Yours faithfully,

Section 40
[Redacted Signature]

Reporter

09-08-2007

094616-002

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 10 August 2007 11:38

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST - ATTENTION Section 40
Section 40


Dear Madam,

I can confirm that I have received your Freedom of Information request regarding UFO sightings over Shropshire. However, I should be grateful if you would clarify what information you require when you ask for "any information held by your organisation regarding my request and considered relevant to my request". Until such time as we received your request, the MoD had no knowledge of it.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI
05-H-Section 40
MoD Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 16 August 2007 11:56

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 09-08-2007-130728-011

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 8 August 2007 asking whether the MoD had any files on UFOs in Cornwall and whether there had ever been any contact with aliens.

The MoD does not file information on UFOs by location and therefore we have no file specifically relating to Cornwall.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

You may wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after five years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>. The Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website also contains some released information on UFOs. This can be accessed the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under UFO reports.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

*HAVE COPY ALSO SENT
AT ELECTRONIC REVIEW
BY MOD GO.*

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

16/08/2007

JD Main Building
London
SW1A 2HB



From: **Section 40**
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Our Reference
09-08-2007-130728-011

Date
15 August 2007

Truro

Cornwall

Section 40

Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 8 August 2007 asking whether the MoD had any files on UFOs in Cornwall and whether there had ever been any contact with aliens.

The MoD does not file information on UFOs by location and therefore we have no file specifically relating to Cornwall.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

You may wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after five years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>. The Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website also contains some released information on UFOs. This can be accessed the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under UFO reports.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act.

Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area, obscuring the name and any handwritten notes.

JULIE

EV 6 JET 07

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 09 August 2007 13:08
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request 09-08-2007-130728-011 Section 40
Categories: FOI Information Request

Section 40

Thanks.

Section 40

Info-AccessOps5

Section 40

Main Building

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 08 August 2007 20:23
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request 09-08-2007-130728-011 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Wednesday, August 8, 2007 at 20:22:40

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: Section 40

txtoccupation: retail

txtaddress1: Section 40

txtaddress2: Section 40

txttowncity: Section 40

txtstatecountry: truro, cornwall


txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: United Kingdom

txtemailAddress: Section 40

txttelephone: Section 40

txtinforequest: do u have any files on ufo's in Cornwall? Has there ever been any contacted with aliens?



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 15 August 2007 13:25

To: Section 40

Subject: release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 15-08-2007-131054-001

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 15 August 2007 asking for the number of UFO reports for North Warwickshire over the past three years.

The information you require can be found on the Ministry of Defence website www.mod.uk by searching in the publication scheme under "UFO Reports".

You may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after five years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

15/08/2007

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 15 August 2007 13:12
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 15-08-2007-131054-001 Section 40

Categories: FOI Information Request

Section 40

Can I interest you with this FOI request?

Regards

Section 40
FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 15 August 2007 11:08
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 15-08-2007-131054-001 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 at 11:07:52

txttitle: Section 40
txtfirstname: Section 40
txtlastname:
txtoccupation: Reporter
txtorganisation: Midland Newspapers
txtaddress1: Section 40
txtaddress2:
txttowncity: Hinckley
txtstatecountry: Leics
txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40
txtcountry: UK
txtemailAddress: Section 40
txttelephone: Section 40

txtinforequest: I would like to know how many UFO sightings there have been in the North Warwickshire region over the past three years.

If possible could I have this information by next Wednesday (August 22)



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 14 August 2007 11:46

To: Section 40

Subject: release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 06-08-2007-150438-002

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 2 August 2007 regarding an incident at Hepton Hill, Wiltshire, on 31 October 1994 when part of an aircraft fell into a field. You asked if the Ministry of Defence had any record of this incident and if we could tell you what the object was.

The MoD has no record of this incident and no knowledge of what the object was. As you state the Police and Fire Brigade were involved, perhaps you should direct your query towards them, as they may have a record of the incident.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

14/08/2007

02-08-2007-152478-002
EX 31 AUG 07

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 02 August 2007 12:49


To: Info-Access-Office


Subject: FOI written request 02-08-2007-164610-004 **Section 40**


Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on
Thursday, August 2, 2007 at 12:48:57

txttitle: **Section 40**

txtfirstname: **Section 40** 

txtlastname: 

txtaddress1: 

txtaddress2: 

txttowncity: alvehcurch

txtstatecountry: worcestershire

txtzipcodepostcode: **Section 40**

txtcountry: United Kingdom

txtemailAddress: **Section 40** 

txtinforequest: Im researching into an incident that took place on the
31st of October 1994, when what appears to be part of an aircraft fell
down into a field at Hepton Hill Wiltshire near the villages of Church
Lench and Norton. Attracting the attention of the Police and Fire
Brigade who cordoned off the area. I gather an object was recovered and
transported away from the scene, can you confirm(1) Any knowledge of
this incident(2) If so what was the object? please.

CASE HISTORY No 7: Hepton Hill, Wilts. 1994

Villagers in the Cotswolds reported seeing a barrel-shaped craft fall into an isolated field on the evening of Halloween in 1994.

But they were later told it was a bale of straw.

The incident happened at Hepton Hill in Wiltshire near the villages of Church Lench and Norton.

The strange object was described by one witness Paul Brooke as resembling a 40-gallon drum.

Police sealed off the field and people were warned to keep away. The object was loaded on to a Royal Navy lorry and taken away. Residents raised the matter with both the Fleet Air Arm and the RAF, each of whom later denied any knowledge of the incident.

A police spokesman said: "Our investigations reveal it was a bale of straw that was on fire and which the fire brigade put out. Reports of something falling from the sky are either hoaxes or somebody has said something had come to the wrong conclusion."

Brooke replied: "What do the police think that we are all mad around here?"

Section 40

From: AHB(RAF)&PCB(AIR)-(RAF)-PCB(AIR)
Sent: 07 August 2007 10:01
To: Section 40
Subject: RE: FOI REQUEST

Section 40

We have no information on this. If it was an RAF aircraft the Flight Safety Staff at Air Command may have something - contact Sqn Ldr Section 40 on Section 40. If it was civilian the AAIB at Farnborough might be able to help - sorry no contact details.

Regards,

Section 40

AHB(RAF)&PCB(Air)

Section 40

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 06 August 2007 15:39
To: AHB(RAF)&PCB(AIR)-(RAF)-PCB(AIR)
Subject: FOI REQUEST

Section 40


I have an FOI request asking if we have details of an object falling from an aircraft on 31 October 1994 in Wiltshire.

Although it's meant to be a UFO related incident, would you have a record of any accident. I don't think we are looking at a crash!

Section 40

DAS-FOI

Section 40



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 14 August 2007 09:39

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 09-08-2007-131235-012

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 8 August 2007 asking for Top Secret or above documents on UFO research.

The MoD has no documents at Top Secret or above on the subject of UFO research.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 13 August 2007 08:58
To: Section 40
Cc:
Subject: RE: FOI written request 09-08-2007-131235-012 Section 40

Categories: FOI Information Request

Section 40

Confirmed.

Section 40

Section 40

DI CSD-Sec 2

Section 40

angela.embleton876@mod.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 10 August 2007 11:46
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request 09-08-2007-131235-012 Section 40
Importance: High

Section 40

Can you confirm you have no Top Secret or above files on UFOs and I will respond on behalf of both of us.

Section 40

DAS-FOI

Section 40

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 10 August 2007 10:26
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request 09-08-2007-131235-012 Section 40
Importance: High

Not heard from you on this.

Section 40

Info-AccessOps5

Section 40

Main Building

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 09 August 2007 13:14
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request 09-08-2007-131235-012 Section 40

Section 40

Thanks

Section 40

Info-AccessOps5

Section 40

Main Building

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]

Sent: 08 August 2007 23:09

To: Info-Access-Office

Subject: FOI written request 09-08-2007-131235-012 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Wednesday, August 8, 2007 at 23:09:18

txttitle: Section 40

txtfirstname: Section 40

txtlastname: [REDACTED]

txtoccupation: IT Tec

txtaddress1: Section 40

txtaddress2: none

txttowncity: Winsford

txtstatecountry: Cheshire

txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40

txtcountry: UK

txtemailAddress: Section 40

txtinforequest: Top Secret or above Top Secret Documents on ufo research.



REGISTERED FILE No.		DIVISION / DIRECTORATE / BRANCH:	
Enclosure Jacket No		DAS-FOI	
DATE OPENED (Date of First Enclosure)			
.....			
SUBJECT: FOI REQUEST			
Section 40 [REDACTED] - 17-05-2007-110357-003			
PQ's + BACKGROUND NOTES			
Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date

USER NOTES

1. A MOD Form 262A (File Record Sheet) must be raised for each new Temporary Enclosure Jacket (TEJ) created. The TEJ should also include a minute sheet.
2. When a TEJ is incorporated into the parent file it should be placed in the file in date order (according to the date of the last action on the TEJ) and allocated an enclosure number.
3. The file minute sheet should be annotated to record the enclosure number of the TEJ along with details of the number of enclosures contained within it. The TEJ record sheet (MOD Form 262A) should be annotated to record the date on which the TEJ was incorporated into the parent file (JSP 441, paragraph 4.13 refers).

AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 17-05-2007-110357-003 Expiry: 10 Aug 07

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Copy of background notes and supporting internal documentation for 5 PQs on the subject of UFOs between 1997-2001

Case for release of information

There is no reason to withhold the information.

Personal details have been redacted under exemption s.40 (Personal information)

Details of other PQs not relevant to the request have been withheld

Release has been agreed by USofS and the Clearing House

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to release the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: **B2** Name: **Section 40**

Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05.. **Section 40** ..

Date: **10/10/07**

Section 40

From: Section 40 [redacted]@gsi.gov.uk
Sent: 09 August 2007 15:38
To: Section 40 [redacted]
Subject: UFO PQs ch ref 7524

Section 40

Given - the age of the material, the fact that it is factual background and that you plan to redact personal information (and anything remotely sensitive (the book stuff) etc) - and that you want to release, disclosure seems reasonable to me.

Section 40

Information Rights
Selborne House

Section 40

Tel Section 40 [redacted]
Fax [redacted]

email Section 40 [redacted]@gsi.gov.uk

Constitution Directorate: strengthening democracy and rights

This e-mail (and any attachment) is intended only for the attention of the addressee(s). Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return e-mail.

Internet e-mail is not a secure medium. Any reply to this message could be intercepted and read by someone else. Please bear that in mind when deciding whether to send material in response to this message by e-mail.

This e-mail (whether you are the sender or the recipient) may be monitored, recorded and retained by the Ministry of Justice. E-mail monitoring / blocking software may be used, and e-mail content may be read at any time. You have a responsibility to ensure laws are not broken when composing or forwarding e-mails and their contents.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet Anti-Virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

From: Section 40 Cdr on behalf of USofS-Private Office
Sent: 24 July 2007 13:13
To: Section 40 DAS-XO; DGMC-DNews RAF; DGInfo
Cc: Section 40
Subject: FW: MINISTERIAL SUBMISSION - USE OF EXEMPTION S.36 TO FOI ACT.

Attachments: Minsub Section 40 Release of PQs.doc; Annex A to Section 40 Minsub.doc; Draft response to Section 40 doc; PQ 0862I and 0861I Lord Hill-Norton.tif; PQ 0305L Lord Hill-Norton.tif; PQ 0348L Lord Hill-Norton.tif; PQ 0355L Lord Hill-Norton.tif; PQ 3295I Lord Hill-Norton.tif
 The Minister has approved the partial release of this information. He thinks the Department can make something of this during recess and would look to DGMC to take this forward ensuring suitable press lines are available if required.

Rgds

Section 40

Cdr RN
 Military Assistant to Under Secretary of State
 ☒ Level 5 Zone B
 ☒ Section 40
 Section 40
 ☒ Section 40
 ☒ Section 40 @mod.uk

From: Section 40
Sent: 17 July 2007 15:14
To: USofS-Private Office
Subject: FW: MINISTERIAL SUBMISSION - USE OF EXEMPTION S.36 TO FOI ACT.

Section 40
 Assistant Private Secretary / Under Secretary of State
 Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 17 July 2007 15:13
To: Section 40
Cc: DAS-XO; DGMC-DNews RAF; DGInfo
Subject: MINISTERIAL SUBMISSION - USE OF EXEMPTION S.36 TO FOI ACT.

Section 40

Please find attached a Ministerial Submission regarding an FOI request to release five PQ and background notes on the subject of UFOs. In fact, there are actually six PQs as two were combined in one answer in Hansard. I have attached the relevant documents. They have been redacted already to exclude names, addresses and telephone numbers of officials.

The background note to PQ3295 was a combined note covering five separate PQs which do not form part of the information requested. Only details relevant to PQ3295 will be released. I have highlighted in orange those paragraphs not relevant to the FOI request which will be withheld.

A number of statements relating to Mr Nick Pope will be withheld under s.40 as they are speculation relating to activities in his private life. These have also been highlighted in orange.

DAS are content for the PQs to be released since they relate to matters long since past. However, since advice to ministers is involved, I have informed the Clearing House as there are potential cross government implications.



From: **Section 40**
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Our Reference

17-05-2007-110357-003

Date

10 August 2007

Hessle

East Yorks

Section 40

Dear **Section 40**

I wrote to you on 19 July 2007 informing you that your request for background information relating to six Parliamentary Questions from Admiral of the Fleet, The Lord Hill Norton, between October 1997 and January 2001, had been considered to fall within the scope of Section 36 of the Freedom of Information Act and the MoD was therefore required to consider whether there are any overriding reasons why the disclosure would not be in the public interest. This consideration is now concluded and I am writing to provide you with the outcome.

The Ministry of Defence holds a number of papers relevant to your request including copies of draft answers and background notes. This information falls within the scope of Section 36 (2)(b)(i) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 – prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs, as it relates to information that would be likely to inhibit the free and frank provision of advice.

Against disclosure of the information is the need to ensure that officials are able to provide Ministers with free and frank opinions and advice in support of draft answers provided to parliamentary questions without this information becoming public. Routine release of such information could inhibit this process and therefore prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs. This would not be in the public interest.

However, this must be balanced against the public need to be assured that accurate information is provided in answers provide by Ministers in response to parliamentary questions. All Freedom of Information requests are considered individually on their merits, and in this case, the age and contents off the background information has been taken into account. It is considered that there is no longer a harm with the release of the majority of the background papers. The balance of public interest therefore falls in favour of release.

However, you should note that some personal information relating to officials including names, addresses and telephone numbers has been withheld under exemption S.40 (Personal Information). Additionally, a small amount of information relating to an official's activities outside the MoD has been withheld under S.40 (Personal Information).

You will also note that a number of paragraphs in the background notes for PQ3295L and PQ0350L have been withheld because they relate to other Parliamentary Questions and therefore are not relevant to your request.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40



D/DAS/10/2/8/13

17 July 2007

PS/PUS

Copied to:

DG Info
DAS-XO
D News(RAF)

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

Reference: 17-05-2007-110357-003 **Section 40**

Issue

1. The MoD has received a Freedom of Information request for briefing papers and internal correspondence relating to six Parliamentary Questions concerning UFO matters. Details of the full request are attached at Annex A. This information falls within the scope of a qualified exemption of the Freedom of Information Act, namely: exemption s.36 (Prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs).

Recommendation

2. That the Minister approve the partial release of this information, subject to redactions of personal information withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information) of The Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Timing

3. Routine. The MoD is required to respond to the individual by 10 August 2007.

Background

4. The applicant has requested copies of briefing papers and internal correspondence for six written parliamentary questions raised by Admiral of the Fleet, The Lord Hill Norton, between October 1997 and January 2001. The questions cover the so called 1980 *Rendlesham Incident*, when a UFO was alleged to have been seen outside RAF Woodbridge in Suffolk. The remaining PQ related to an alleged UFO sighting at RAF Cosford and RAF Shawbury in 1993. Despite the age of both incidents, they still hold considerable interest for those members of the public interested in UFOs.

5. The information falls within the scope of a qualified exemption to the Freedom of Information Act 2000. As such, it is necessary for the MoD to consider whether there are any overriding reasons why disclosure would not be in the public interest.

The Case against Disclosure

6. Against disclosure of the information is the need to ensure that officials are able to provide Ministers with free and frank opinions and advice in support of draft answers provided to PQs without this information becoming public. Routine release of such information could inhibit this process and therefore prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs. This would not be in the public interest.

7. However, this must be balanced against the public need to be assured that accurate information is provided in answers by Ministers in response to parliamentary questions. All Freedom of Information requests are considered individually on their merits, and in this case, the age and contents of the background information has been taken into account.

The Case for Disclosure

8. Although three of the PQ's date from 2001, the subject matter is considerably older, dealing with the Rendlesham Incident in 1980. The MoD has already published its file on this alleged incident on its website. Our only interest in this matter now, is in answering correspondence from interested members of the public. Likewise we have no interest in the alleged sighting in 1993. It is considered that there is no longer harm in the release of the majority of the background papers. The balance of public interest therefore falls in favour of release.

9. That having been said, it will be necessary to withhold personnel information, such as names and addresses of officials under exemption s.40 (Personal Information), which is standard practice. Speculation contained within the background notes as to the role and actions of Mr Nick Pope, should also be withheld under the same exemption. Mr Pope, a former civil servant, remains a figure of some contention within the ufology community and his activities have been the subject of a number of FOI requests. The Minister may recall he recently up held the use of exemption s.36 in relation to the release of material concerning internal discussions regarding the release of Mr Pope's book "Open Skies, Closed Minds", which dealt with his time in Sec(AS) dealing with UFO matters.

10. The applicant, **Section 40** a longstanding correspondent on UFO matters, received 13 UFO related PQs together with background notes in 2006, following agreement with USofS' office.

Conclusion

11. In view of the above, we submit that the public interest against disclosure is not sufficient to withhold the information. A draft letter to the applicant is attached at Annex B.

Section 40

DAS-FOI
MB 5.H

Section 40

AUTHORISED BY: Section 40
GRADE/RANK: B2
BRANCH: DAS AD (Secretariat)

TEL: Section 40

Text of FOI request 17-05-2007-110357-003

In the interim please consider this email an FOIA enquiry for briefing papers and internal correspondence, trimmed to your specification of maximum 5 parliamentary questions. Included is a bit more information relevant to each, for your reference.

1) 14 October 1997 Lords Hansard (Written Answer): Lt Charles Halt memorandum, one PQ from Hill-Norton answered by Lord Gilbert.

2) 15 July 1998 Lords Hansard (Written Answer HL2612): Unidentified Flying Objects: Hill-Norton Question: 'How many military personnel witnessed the unidentified craft that overflew RAF Cosford and RAF Shawbury on 31 March 1993; and whether, when the craft has not been identified, such an event ought to be classified as being of no defence significance.' Answered by Lord Gilbert.

3) 25 January 2001 Lords Hansard [Written Answer HL303]: Lord Hill Norton PQ: 'Whether they [HMG] are aware of any involvement by Special Branch personnel in the investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident.' Answered by Baroness Symons

4) 25 January 2001 Lords Hansard [Written Answer HL301]: Lord Hill Norton PQ: 'Whether personnel from Porton Down visited Rendlesham Forest or the area surrounding RAF Walton in December 1980 or January 1981; and whether they are aware of any tests carried out in either of those two areas aimed at assessing any nuclear, biological or chemical hazard.' Answered by Baroness Symons

5) 30 January 2001 Lords Hansard [Written Answer HL322]: Lord Hill Norton PQ: 'Whether they [HMG] are aware of any investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident carried out by the United States Air Force, the Air Force Office of Special Investigations or any other United States Agency.' Answered by Baroness Symons

Note: The PQ referred to a 1) above in fact relates to two PQs that were amalgamated into one answer in Lords Hansard.

DRAFT

Dear **Section 40**

I wrote to you on 19 July 2007 informing you that your request for background information relating to six Parliamentary Questions from Admiral of the Fleet, The Lord Hill Norton, between October 1997 and January 2001, had been considered to fall within the scope of Section 36 of the Freedom of Information Act and the MoD was therefore required to consider whether there are any overriding reasons why the disclosure would not be in the public interest. This consideration is now concluded and I am writing to provide you with the outcome.

The Ministry of Defence holds a number of papers relevant to your request including copies of draft answers and background notes. This information falls within the scope of Section 36 (2)(b)(i) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 – prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs, as it relates to information that would be likely to inhibit the free and frank provision of advice.

Against disclosure of the information is the need to ensure that officials are able to provide Ministers with free and frank opinions and advice in support of draft answers provided to parliamentary questions without this information becoming public. Routine release of such information could inhibit this process and therefore prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs. This would not be in the public interest.

However, this must be balanced against the public need to be assured that accurate information is provided in answers provided by Ministers in response to parliamentary questions. All Freedom of Information requests are considered individually on their merits, and in this case, the age and contents of the background information has been taken into account. It is considered that there is no longer a harm with the release of the majority of the background papers. The balance of public interest therefore falls in favour of release.

However, you should note that some personal information relating to officials including names, addresses and telephone numbers has been withheld under exemption S.40 (Personal Information). Additionally, a small amount of information relating to an officials activities outside the MoD has been withheld under S.40 (Personal Information).

You will also note that a number of paragraphs in the background notes for PQ3295L and PQ0350L have been withheld because they relate to other Parliamentary Questions and therefore are not relevant to your request.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation,

6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 19 June 2007 12:25
To: Section 40
Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 17-05-2007-110357-003

Hi Section 40

Thanks for your reply to my amended Freedom Of Information request concerning PQs and Lord Hill Norton and news of the application of exemption S 36 - I recall having a similar problem with this exemption in the past concerning PQs about Martin Redmond, again I would have thought that material as dated as this would not require this exemption and that the historical nature of this information would indeed easily be outweighed by public interest, (especially since Lord Hill Norton is now deceased). It's quite possible that other interested members of the public will ask for this information and concerning the other parliamentary questions from the previous request at some future point. If there is a negative decision to not release this information, I might have to consider using the internal review process. (Though I would rather not waste tax payers money). Anyhow, I thank you for your work and diligence and patiently await the outcome of the MoD's decision.

Sincerely

Section 40

----- Original Message -----

From: Section 40
To: Section 40
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 10:20 AM
Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 17-05-2007-110357-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail of 15 May 2007 which amended your previous FOI request for copies of briefing papers and internal correspondence for Parliamentary Questions relating to UFOs.

I can inform you that the Ministry of Defence holds information relevant to these requests but we believe this information falls within the scope of a qualified exemption of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This is exemption S.36 – Prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs. As a qualified exemption, it is necessary for the Ministry of Defence to consider whether there are overriding reasons why disclosure would not be in the public interest.

The Freedom of Information Act requires us to respond to requests promptly and in any case no later than 20 working days after receiving your request. However, when a qualified exemption applies to the information and the public interest test has to be conducted, the Act allows the time for response to be longer than the 20 working days. A full response must be provided within such time as is reasonable in all circumstances of the case and, in response to your requests, it is estimated that it will take a further 40 working days to make a final decision on where the balance of public interest lies. It is therefore planned to let you have a response by 10 August 2006. If it appears that it will take longer than this to reach a conclusion I will let you know.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

19/06/2007

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 19 June 2007 10:16
To: Section 40
Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST - 17-05-2007-110357-003

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your e-mail of 15 May 2007 which amended your previous FOI request for copies of briefing papers and internal correspondence for Parliamentary Questions relating to UFOs.

I can inform you that the Ministry of Defence holds information relevant to these requests but we believe this information falls within the scope of a qualified exemption of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This is exemption S.36 – Prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs. As a qualified exemption, it is necessary for the Ministry of Defence to consider whether there are overriding reasons why disclosure would not be in the public interest.

The Freedom of Information Act requires us to respond to requests promptly and in any case no later than 20 working days after receiving your request. However, when a qualified exemption applies to the information and the public interest test has to be conducted, the Act allows the time for response to be longer than the 20 working days. A full response must be provided within such time as is reasonable in all circumstances of the case and, in response to your requests, it is estimated that it will take a further 40 working days to make a final decision on where the balance of public interest lies. It is therefore planned to let you have a response by 10 August 2006. If it appears that it will take longer than this to reach a conclusion I will let you know.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI
05-H-Section 40
MoD Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

19/06/2007

Section 40

From: Section 40
 Sent: 15 May 2007 19:57
 To: Section 40
 Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 15-05-2007-112958-002

This message was quarantined by the IGS in line with current MoD security policy, quarantine reference 'l4FIInbD004537.2104'. Its release has been sanctioned by DCSA.

An attachment to this email may contain a potentially harmful file.

If this email is unsolicited DO NOT open the attachment and advise your local help desk. If you requested the attachment ensure that a virus scan is carried out by your local System Administrator before the file is run/installed/executed.

Hi Section 40

Thanks for your prompt reply -- I thought it may be too much for one enquiry, though I am interested in the MoD background to all of the questions. Perhaps I should submit separate enquiries after the time expires for a FOIA enquiry, for further PQs relating to Lord Hill Norton.

In the interim please consider this email an FOIA enquiry for briefing papers and internal correspondence, trimmed to your specification of maximum 5 parliamentary questions. Included is a bit more information relevant to each, for your reference.

1) 14 October 1997 Lords Hansard (Written Answer): Lt Charles Halt memorandum, one PQ from Hill-Norton answered by Lord Gilbert.

PQ 0862 i
 PQ 0861 i

2) 15 July 1998 Lords Hansard (Written Answer HL2612): Unidentified Flying Objects: Hill-Norton Question: 'How many military personnel witnessed the unidentified craft that overflew RAF Cosford and RAF Shawbury on 31 March 1993; and whether, when the craft has not been identified, such an event ought to be classified as being of no defence significance.' Answered by Lord Gilbert.

PQ 3295 i

3) 25 January 2001 Lords Hansard [Written Answer HL303]: Lord Hill Norton PQ: 'Whether they [HMG] are aware of any involvement by Special Branch personnel in the investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident.' Answered by Baroness Symons

PQ 0355 L

4) 25 January 2001 Lords Hansard [Written Answer HL301]: Lord Hill Norton PQ: 'Whether personnel from Porton Down visited Rendlesham Forest or the area surrounding RAF Walton in December 1980 or January 1981; and whether they are aware of any tests carried out in either of those two areas aimed at assessing any nuclear, biological or chemical hazard.' Answered by Baroness Symons

PQ 0348 L

5) 30 January 2001 Lords Hansard [Written Answer HL322]: Lord Hill Norton PQ: 'Whether they [HMG] are aware of any investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident carried out by the United States Air Force, the Air Force Office of Special Investigations or any other United States Agency.' Answered by Baroness Symons.

PQ 0355 L

Best Regards

Section 40

18/06/2007

Section 40

Hessle.
East Yorkshire.

Section 40

----- Original Message -----

From: Section 40

To: Section 40

Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2007 2:29 PM

Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 15-05-2007-112958-002

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 9 May 2007 asking for MoD briefing papers and internal correspondence relating to some 19 parliamentary questions on a range of subjects.

As you expected, the costs of providing you with the information you request are likely to exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and, as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request. However, if you could limit your request to a maximum of five parliamentary questions, I may be in a position to help you.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within two calendar months of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

I am sorry I could not be of more assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40

From: Section 40
 Sent: 15 May 2007 20:02
 To: Section 40
 Subject: Re: FOIA 15-05-2007-112958-002 addendum

This message was quarantined by the IGS in line with current MoD security policy, quarantine reference 'l4FIrXdH016015.2105'. Its release has been sanctioned by DCSA.

An attachment to this email may contain a potentially harmful file.

*If this email is unsolicited **DO NOT** open the attachment and advise your local help desk. If you requested the attachment ensure that a virus scan is carried out by your local System Administrator before the file is run/installed/executed.*

Hi Again Section 40

As addendum to my last post and revised FOIA enquiry on Lord Hill Norton PQs, I forgot to mention, questions 3 & 4 [25 Jan 2001] are among a group of PQs with the title 'Rendlesham Forest incident' in Lords Hansard.

Question 5 [30 Jan 2001] is among a group of PQs with the title 'Rendlesham Forest/RAF Bentwaters incident', in Lords Hansard. If this helps.

Best Regards

Section 40

----- Original Message -----

From: Section 40
 To: Section 40
 Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2007 2:29 PM
 Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 15-05-2007-112958-002

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 9 May 2007 asking for MoD briefing papers and internal correspondence relating to some 19 parliamentary questions on a range of subjects.

As you expected, the costs of providing you with the information you request are likely to exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and, as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request. However, if you could limit your request to a maximum of five parliamentary questions, I may be in a position to help you.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within two calendar months of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

18/06/2007

● you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

I am sorry I could not be of more assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
TEMPORARY ENCLOSURE JACKET

MOD Form 174D
 (Revised 5/99)

33

REGISTERED FILE No. D/DAS(SEC)64/A		DIVISION / DIRECTORATE / BRANCH: DAS (SEC)	
Enclosure Jacket No9.....			
DATE OPENED (Date of First Enclosure)17 JAN 01.....			
SUBJECT: PA 0350L LORD HILL-NORTON REPLY BY BARONESS SYMONS			
Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date

USER NOTES

1. A MOD Form 262A (File Record Sheet) must be raised for each new Temporary Enclosure Jacket (TEJ) created. The TEJ should also include a minute sheet.
2. When a TEJ is incorporated into the parent file it should be placed in the file in date order (according to the date of the last action on the TEJ) and allocated an enclosure number.
3. The file minute sheet should be annotated to record the enclosure number of the TEJ along with details of the number of enclosures contained within it. The TEJ record sheet (MOD Form 262A) should be annotated to record the date on which the TEJ was incorporated into the parent file (JSP 441, paragraph 4.13 refers).

RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED

TEMPLATE TO BE USED FOR REPLY



Ministry of Defence

FRIDAY 26 JANUARY 2001

Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB(X) (CB)

LORDS WRITTEN

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they are aware of any involvement by Special Branch personnel in the investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident. (HL303)

Minister replying Baroness Symons

Special Branch officers may have been aware of the incident but would not have shown an interest unless there was evidence of a potential threat to national security. No such interest appears to have been shown.

18 January 01

PQ Ref 0350L

BACKGROUND NOTE

Linked to PQ 0348..

REMEMBER you are accountable for the accuracy and timeliness of the advice you provide. Departmental Instructions on answering PQs can be viewed on the CHOTS public area and on DAWN.

DRAFTED BY	:	[REDACTED]	TEL:	[REDACTED]
AUTHORISED BY	:	[REDACTED]	TEL:	[REDACTED]
GRADE/RANK	:	B1		
BRANCH	:	DAS(Sec)		

DECLARATION: I have satisfied myself that the above answer and background note are in accordance with the Government's policy on answering PQs, Departmental instructions (DCI GEN 150/97), and the Open Government Code (DCI GEN 54/98).

DATE FOR RETURN : 12:00 ON 18 January 2001
PQ REFERENCE : PQ 0350L
PQ TYPE : LORDS WRITTEN
MINISTER REPLYING : -NOTFOUND-

5

LEAD BRANCH: : SEC (AS)
COPY ADDRESSEE(S) :
MDP Sec
D (F&S)AIR 1
Defence Evaluation & Research
Head of Sec HSF
GVIU
D SEF POL
D NEWS
HD of MDP QQR

- The answer and background note must be authorised by a civil servant at Senior Civil Service level or a military officer at one-star level or above who is responsible for ensuring that the information and advice provided is accurate and reflects Departmental Instructions on answering PQs DCI GEN 150/97.
- Those contributing information for PQ answers and background notes are responsible for ensuring the information is accurate.
- The attached checklist should be used by those drafting PQ answers and background material, those contributing information and those responsible for authorising the answer and background note as an aid to ensuring that departmental policy is adhered to.
- If you or others concerned are uncertain about how PQs are answered seek advice from a senior civil servant in or closely associated with your area.

Peer's DETAIL: Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB

QUESTION

To ask Her Majesty's Government To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they are aware of any involvement by Special Branch personnel in the investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident. (HL303)

*assessor here
was an investigation*



Home Office

Action Against Crime and Disorder Unit

50 Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1H 9AT

Switchboard

Facsimile

Direct Line

4

FAX

URGENT

To: [REDACTED] DAS 4a (Sec) - Ministry of Defence

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 18 January 2001

Time: 11.20am

Fax number: [REDACTED]

Number of pages: 4
(including this one)

If any part of this fax is unclear please telephone: [REDACTED]

PQs ON RENDLESHAM FOREST INCIDENT IN 1980

I have enclosed a response from Suffolk Constabulary concerning PQ's on the Rendlesham Forest incident in 1980. As you will see, they have enclosed a letter from Inspector [REDACTED] to Ms Bruni on the incident which concerns Suffolk police involvement at the time. This appears to be their only interest but I note that the contents of this letter was already included in the chapter of Ms Bruni's book which was enclosed. I think that the answer to this question will have to be that [REDACTED] did investigate incident (as per Mr [REDACTED] letter) at the time but that it has been impossible to locate the incident files for a more detailed response. Also most of the officers serving at the time have since retired including Mr [REDACTED].

NO do not consider that a search of the files may be accomplished in the time allowed.

I suggest that the answer to the [REDACTED] question is that they may have been aware at the time of the incident but would not have got involved due to there being no threat to national security.

use of line from Suffolk Constabulary agreed long over the phone.

Public Order Section

18.1.01

*22 Jan.
Suffolk
Police*

*18 Jan.
Special
Branch*

SUFFOLK CONSTABULARY

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

**FORCE HEADQUARTERS
MARTLESHAM HEATH
IPSWICH IP5 3QS**

Tel: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED] E-mail: [REDACTED]

DATE : 18 January 2001

TO : Home Office Action Against Crime
and Disorder Unit

FAX NO. : [REDACTED]

FOR ATTENTION OF : [REDACTED] Public Order Section

ORIGINATOR : [REDACTED] Executive Services Manager

PAGES TO FOLLOW : 2

TEXT

[REDACTED]

As discussed please find a copy of a letter sent to Georgina Bruni in July 1999 which may be of use. As also discussed due to the period elapsed since the 'incident' it has not been possible to locate any files (due to them being stored in a different location). Furthermore the situation is exacerbated by the fact that most police officers serving at that time have since retired (including the author of the attached letter!).

I trust this will suffice.

[REDACTED]
Executive Services Manager

Confidentiality Notice - this message is intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential or privileged. Unauthorised use is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the addressee, you should not read, copy, disclose or otherwise use this message, except for the purpose of delivery to the addressee. Please telephone the above number if this fax is incomplete, illegible, or if you have received it in error.



REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

FORCE HEADQUARTERS, MARTLESHAM HEATH, IPSWICH IP5 7QS
 Tel: Ipswich [REDACTED] Telex: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]
 All official correspondence should be addressed to the Chief Constable

[REDACTED] Esq. QPM
 Chief Constable

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

28 July 1999

Dear Ms Bruni,

INCIDENT IN RENDLESHAM FOREST - DECEMBER 1980

I refer to your letter of 22 July 1999 in relation to a series of unusual events which allegedly occurred outside the perimeter of RAF Woodbridge, Suffolk, during the last week of December 1980.

A great deal of interest has understandably been generated in respect of this story, not least because of the apparent number and standing of witnesses. However, over the intervening years, various reports of the incident(s) seem to have taken on a life of their own to the extent that the 'sighting' details and corroborative evidence have been substantially embellished. This contrasts sharply with the views of the local police who attended at the time and did not perceive this occurrence as being anything unusual considering the festive significance of the date and expected high spirits.

Such a perception lends support to the lack of police documentary evidence and one needs to understand the minimalistic nature of rural policing in order to appreciate the answers which I will attempt to give to your questions.

- (1) Both Pc [REDACTED] and Pc [REDACTED] have retired from the force but, being a long standing friend of the former, I have spoken to him recently and at great length in response to other similar journalistic enquiries. He does not recall making any official report and there is no evidence that one was made.
- (2) [REDACTED] has confirmed that he and Pc [REDACTED] were in the Law Enforcement Office at RAF Bentwaters when they were diverted to a 'higher priority' task at Otley post office. As rural night-duty officers they would have sole responsibility for policing a huge territorial area (approx 400 square miles) and would certainly have treated a post office burglary as more important than a recurrence of an earlier incident which was seen as somewhat frivolous.
- (3) Pc [REDACTED] (also now retired) visit to the alleged landing site would not have generated more than a standard incident log unless he was convinced that something worth reporting had occurred. Pc [REDACTED] had discussed the matter with him and it appeared that all three officers were equally unimpressed with the night events.
- (4) Civilian police officers were not employed in guarding the area surrounding the alleged landing site(s) or to deter access as there was no evidence to indicate that anything of immediate concern to the police had occurred.

continued

Georgina Bruni

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

- (5) There is no documentary evidence that police officers were involved in similar incidents on 27-31 December that year and Pc [REDACTED] cannot recall any further requests for police attendance.
- (6) Special Branch officers ^{may} should have been aware of the incident(s) (through having sight of the Incident Log(s)) but would not have shown an interest unless there was evidence of a potential threat to national security. No such threat was evident.

I have tried to be as objective as possible with the answers provided and, like yourself, would undoubtedly be pleased to see a local incident such as this substantiated as an authentic 'UFO' experience. Pc [REDACTED] holds similar views to myself and returned to the forest site in daylight in case he had missed some evidence in the darkness. There was nothing to be seen and he remains unconvinced that the occurrence was genuine. The immediate area was swept by powerful light beams from a landing beacon at RAF Bentwaters and the Orfordness lighthouse. I know from personal experience that at night, in certain weather and cloud conditions, these beams were very pronounced and certainly caused strange visual effects.

If you have any other query in respect of this subject I will be pleased to discuss the issues further. My direct dial telephone number is [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Inspector - Operations (Planning)



Phone Nos.

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
Sec. [Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted] DAS 4a(Sec)

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Secretariat (Air Staff)

[Redacted] Main Building, Whitehall

LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) [Redacted]

(Switchboard) [Redacted]

(Fax) [Redacted]

CHOTS - DAS4A(SEC)

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Ms [Redacted] - Home Office Fax: [Redacted]

SUBJECT: PQ 0350L/ [Redacted]

DATE: 17 January 01

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER:

[Redacted]
We spoke on the telephone.

I attach copies of the above PQs which I understand from MOD Parliamentary Branch are to be answered by MOD on behalf of HMG as they relate to an incident said to have taken place in 1980 in which MOD has the lead interest. Both make reference to Home Office issues and I was given [Redacted] number as a contact in the Department.

PQ0350 - is to be answered by us by 1200 on 18 January. I would be grateful if you would supply us with an answer to the question and paragraphs to insert in the background note by 0900, 18 January. I attach a short note on the alleged incident in Rendlesham Forest in 1980 and a photocopy of a chapter in the book on the incident that was published in November 2000. The Chapter contains references to Special Branch.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

[REDACTED]

With thanks.

Signed [REDACTED]

BACKGROUND NOTE - PQ TABLED BY LORD HILL-NORTON JAN 01

1. . . . Lord Hill-Norton has tabled XXX PQs on the subject of material contained in a book by Georgina Bruni published in November 2000 and MOD handling of material relating to 'UFOs'. Miss Bruni's book, "You can't tell the people" concerns a well known 'UFO' incident alleged to have occurred in Rendlesham Forest in Suffolk over the Christmas period in 1980 in the vicinity of two RAF bases at that time on lease to the USAF, RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge.
2. The subject of the incident said to have taken place in Rendlesham Forest came to prominence in 1983 when a memorandum sent to MOD shortly after the event by the then Deputy Base Commander, Lt Col Charles Halt USAF, was unearthed in the US by researchers. The Halt memorandum describes the alleged incident in some detail and is reprinted in the book where claims are also made that USAF personnel met and communicated with "beings". The book accuses the UK establishment of a "cover-up" to hide the detail of the alleged event in Rendlesham Forest. Text of correspondence on the subject between a retired Chief of Defence Staff, Lord Hill-Norton, and a previous MOD Minister is reprinted in the book.
3. MOD's interest in 'UFO's' is limited to whether alleged sightings might have any defence significance; namely, if they provide evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace may have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is corroborating evidence to suggest that the UK's airspace may have been compromised, MOD does not investigate or seek to provide a precise explanation for each of the 'UFO' letters and reported sightings received each year. MOD believes that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for most of the sightings. However, it is not the function of MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service and resources are not diverted for this purpose.



From: [REDACTED], DAS 4a(Sec)

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Secretariat (Air Staff)

[REDACTED], Main Building, Whitehall

LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) [REDACTED]

(Switchboard) [REDACTED]

(Fax) [REDACTED]

CHOTS - DAS4A(SEC)

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Ms [REDACTED] (Home Office) [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: PQ 0350L/ [REDACTED]

DATE: 17 January 01

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 26

[REDACTED]
We spoke on the telephone.

I attach copies of the above PQs which I understand from MOD Parliamentary Branch are to be answered by MOD on behalf of HMG as they relate to an incident said to have taken place in 1980 in which MOD has the lead interest. Both make reference to Home Office issues and I was given **Section 40** **Section 40** number as a contact in the Department.

PQ0350 - is to be answered by us by 1200 on 18 January. I would be grateful if you would supply us with an answer to the question and paragraphs to insert in the background note by 0900, 18 January. I attach a short note on the alleged incident in Rendlesham Forest in 1980 and a photocopy of a chapter in the book on the incident that was published in November 2000. The Chapter contains references to Special Branch.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

2



With thanks.

Signed 

DATE FOR RETURN : 12:00 ON 18 January 2001
PQ REFERENCE : PQ 0350L
PQ TYPE : LORDS WRITTEN
MINISTER REPLYING : -NOTFOUND-

LEAD BRANCH: : SEC (AS)
COPY ADDRESSEE(S) :
MDP Sec
D (F&S)AIR 1
Defence Evaluation& Research
Head of Sec HSF
GVIU
D SEF POL
D NEWS
HD of MDP QQR

- The answer and background note must be authorised by a civil servant at Senior Civil Service level or a military officer at one-star level or above who is responsible for ensuring that the information and advice provided is accurate and reflects Departmental Instructions on answering PQs DCI GEN 150/97.
- Those contributing information for PQ answers and background notes are responsible for ensuring the information is accurate.
- The attached checklist should be used by those drafting PQ answers and background material, those contributing information and those responsible for authorising the answer and background note as an aid to ensuring that departmental policy is adhered to.
- If you or others concerned are uncertain about how PQs are answered seek advice from a senior civil servant in or closely associated with your area.

Peer's DETAIL: Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB

QUESTION

To ask Her Majesty's Government To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they are aware of any involvement by Special Branch personnel in the investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident.
(HL303)

12 JAN 2001

MODE = MEMORY TRANSMISSION

START=17-JAN 12:18

END=17-JAN 12:17

FILE NO. = 050

STN NO.	COM	ADDR NO.	STATION NAME/TEL.NO.	PAGES	DURATION
001	OK	*	[REDACTED]	026/026	00:07'07"

-SECRETARIAT (AIR STAFF) -

- ***** -



From: [REDACTED] DAS 4a(Sec)

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Secretariat (Air Staff)

[REDACTED] Main Building, Whitehall

LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) [REDACTED]

(Switchboard) [REDACTED]

(Fax) [REDACTED]

CHOTS - DAS4A(SEC)

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Ms [REDACTED] (Home Office) [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: PQ 0350L/[REDACTED]

DATE: 17 January 01

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 26

[REDACTED]
We spoke on the telephone.

I attach copies of the above PQs which I understand from MOD Parliamentary Branch are to be answered by MOD on behalf of HMG as they relate to an incident said to have taken place in 1980 in which MOD has the lead interest. Both make reference to Home Office issues and I was given [REDACTED] number as a contact in the Department.

Section 40

Section 40

PQ0350 - is to be answered by us by 1200 on 18 January. I would be grateful if you would supply us with an answer to the question and paragraphs to insert in the background note by 0900, 18 January. I attach a short note on the alleged incident in Rendlesham Forest in 1980 and a photocopy of a chapter in the book on the incident that was published in November 2000. The Chapter contains references to Special Branch.



Lord Hill-Norton asked Her Majesty's Government:

How many military personnel witnessed the unidentified craft that overflew RAF Cosford and RAF Shawbury on 31st March 1993; and whether, when the craft has not been identified, such an event ought to be classified as being of no defence significance.
[HL2612]

The Minister of State for Defence Procurement, Lord Gilbert:

The Ministry of Defence is aware of a single report from two military personnel of an alleged sighting in the West Midlands on 31 March 1993. The facts reported were fully examined at the time. No firm conclusions were drawn then about the nature of what had been seen, but the events were not judged to be of defence significance. The MOD has no reason to doubt the judgments made at the time.

Section 40

Ministry of Defence

15 July 1998

32951



Minister
Content?

[REDACTED]
13/7

OK
[REDACTED]
14/7

OK
[REDACTED]
12/7

Lord Hill-Norton asked Her Majesty's Government:

How many military personnel witnessed the unidentified craft that overflowed RAF Cosford and RAF Shawbury on 31st March 1993; and whether, when the craft has not been identified, such an event ought to be classified as being of no defence significance. [HL2612]

The Minister of State for Defence Procurement, Lord Gilbert:

The Ministry of Defence is aware of a single report from two military personnel of an alleged sighting in the West Midlands on 31 March 1993. The facts reported were fully examined at the time. No firm conclusions were drawn then about the nature of what had been seen, but the events were not judged to be of defence significance. The MOD has no reason to doubt the judgements made at the time.

Ministry of Defence

July 1998

32951

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION - URGENT ACTION REQUIRED

DATE FOR RETURN : 12:00 ON FRIDAY 10 JULY 1998
PQ REFERENCE : PQ 3295i
PQ TYPE : Lord's Written
SUPPLEMENTARIES REQUIRED? : No
MINISTER REPLYING : MINISTER OF STATE FOR DEFENCE
PROCUREMENT
LEAD BRANCH: : SEC (AS)
COPY ADDRESSEE(S) :

QUESTION

Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government how many military personnel witnessed the unidentified craft that overflowed RAF Cosford and RAF Shawbury on 31st March 1993; and whether, when the craft has not been identified, such an event ought to be classified as being of no defence significance.
[HL2612]

DRAFTED BY: [REDACTED]

TEL: [REDACTED]

AUTHORISED BY: [REDACTED]
GRADE/RANK: Grade 7

TEL: [REDACTED]

AUTHORISED BY: [REDACTED]
GRADE/RANK: SCS

TEL: [REDACTED]

DECLARATION: I have satisfied myself that the following answer and background note are in accordance with the Government's policy on answering PQs, Departmental instructions (DCI GEN 150/97), and the Open Government Code (DCI GEN 54/98).

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

ANSWER:

The Ministry of Defence is aware of a single report from two military personnel of an alleged sighting in the West Midlands on 31 March 1993. The facts reported were fully examined at the time. No firm conclusions were drawn then about the nature of what had been seen but the events were not judged to be of defence significance. The MOD has no reason to doubt the judgements made at the time.

LINKED BACKGROUND NOTE: PQs: [REDACTED] 3295 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

POLICY & STAFF

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

PO 3295

8. This alleged sighting has been the subject of previous PQs (Hansard extracts attached). The lights in the sky witnessed in the early hours of 31 March 1993 were seen by a number of people in the West Country and South Wales area. Witnesses included two

2

POLICY & STAFF

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

POLICY & STAFF

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

members of a mobile RAF police patrol on duty at RAF Cosford, a Meteorological Officer at RAF Shawbury and several police officers. All reports were examined at the time but nothing conclusive was established and it must therefore be assumed that officials at the time did not view the alleged incident of defence concern. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] It is not clear from the papers held on file whether the Met Officer was a serviceman or civilian and we have not therefore speculated on this point in the answer.

The Prime Minister: This morning, I had meetings with ministerial colleagues and others. In addition to my duties in the House, I shall be having further meetings later today.

Burma

Mr. Parry: To ask the Prime Minister what recent representations Her Majesty's Government have made to the Government of Burma regarding abuses of human rights; and if he will make a statement. [3178]

The Prime Minister: We have recently issued several statements about violations of human rights in Burma, and did so again yesterday.

In addition, our Ambassador in Rangoon has expressed our grave concern at recent events in Burma on several occasions.

The EU presidency and troika Foreign Ministers also raised these concerns at meetings with the Burmese Foreign Minister on 22 July and 26 September.

Land Mines

Mr. Parry: To ask the Prime Minister what representations he has received from UNICEF concerning land mines in (a) Cambodia and (b) Thailand; and if he will make a statement. [3175]

The Prime Minister: As far as I am aware, none.

Mr. Parry: To ask the Prime Minister what assistance (a) Her Majesty's Government and (b) non-governmental organisations have given to (a) Cambodia, (b) Laos and (c) Thailand in respect of the clearance of land mines; and if he will make a statement. [3176]

The Prime Minister: Since 1 April 1993, the British Government have committed over £5.1 million for humanitarian mine clearance activities in Cambodia, £543,000 in Laos and £5,000 in Thailand, concentrating on specific clearance projects addressing urgent humanitarian needs. Some of these projects are managed by British non-governmental organisations.

We do not have details of all non-governmental organisations' commitments to mine clearance in Cambodia, Laos and Thailand.

DEFENCE

Unidentified Flying Objects

Mr. Redmond: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence (1) what factors underlay his Department's decision that the reported sightings of unidentified flying objects on 5 November 1990 and 31 March 1993 were not of defence significance; [2898]

(2) for what reasons his Department assessed the sightings of an unidentified flying object over RAF Shawbury, referred to in his answer of 24 July, *Official Report*, column 424, as having no defence significance. [2928]

Mr. Soames: I refer the hon. Member to the answer that I gave him on 8 July 1996, *Official Report*, column 26.

Gulf War

Mr. Campbell-Savours: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence if supplies of vaccine 10HO3A supplied to the Chemical and Biological Defence Establishment were used in circumstances relating to the Gulf war. [1674]

Mr. Soames: This is a matter for the chief executive of the Chemical and Biological Defence Establishment. I have asked the chief executive to write to the hon. Member.

Letter from John Chisholm to Mr. Dale Campbell-Savours, dated 12 November 1996:

I have been asked to reply to your Parliamentary Question about whether the Vaccine 10HO3A supplied to the Chemical and Biological Defence Establishment were used in circumstances relating to the Gulf War. I have been asked to reply since The Chemical and Biological Defence Establishment (CBD) is now part of the Defence Evaluation and Research Agency of which I am Chief Executive.

I regret that it is not our policy to provide details of the particular vaccines required for the research programme at CBD Porton Down.

I am sorry I could not be more helpful.

Mr. Campbell-Savours: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence (1) on what date vaccine 10HO3A was received by United Kingdom military personnel in the gulf; [1675]

(2) if named patient requirements as required by the manufacturer were used in the case of vaccine number 10HO3A while used in circumstances relating to the Gulf war; [1673]

(3) on what date Her Majesty's Government purchased from the Miles Drug Company, Miles Pharmaceuticals or Bayer UK vaccine 10HO3A; and which was used in the Gulf war; [1672]

(4) how many British Aerospace personnel (a) did and (b) did not receive doses of vaccine 10HO3A during the course of the Gulf war; [1671]

(5) if he will make a statement on the use of vaccine 10HO3A during the course of the Gulf war. [1670]

Mr. Soames: At present, details relating to biological warfare medical counter measures remain classified for operational reasons.

Mr. Campbell-Savours: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence at what time on the 20 and 21 January 1991 United Kingdom personnel were brought into contact with chemical or biological agents near Dhahran. [1677]

Mr. Soames: No chemical or biological agents were detected at Dhahran on 20 and 21 January 1991.

Mr. Campbell-Savours: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence at what time on the 20 and 21 January 1992 chemical agent monitors indicated sarin in the air in the vicinity of United Kingdom personnel at Dhahran. [1676]

Mr. Soames: There is no evidence of sarin being detected at Dhahran on 20 and 21 January 1991.

Gurkha Troops

Mr. Fatchett: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence how many Gurkha troops will be stationed in Britain as a result of the handover of Hong Kong; where

DEFENCE

Plutonium

Mr. Llew Smith: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence if the United States Government have since 1966 requested the United Kingdom to provide reactor grade plutonium for the purpose of conducting a nuclear test explosion under the provisions of the US-UK mutual defence agreement on atomic energy co-operation. (38500)

Mr. Arbuthnot: No such requests have been made by the United States.

Small Businesses

Mr. David Shaw: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence if he will make a statement on the impact of (a) his policies and (b) the work of his Department in helping small businesses in the last 12 months as against the previous 12 months; and if he will publish the performance indicators by which his Department monitors the impact and the statistical results of such monitoring. (39141)

Mr. Arbuthnot: The Government recognise the crucial role played by small firms in the UK economy and aim to help them by providing sound economic conditions—keeping inflation and interest rates low; reducing legislative administrative and taxation burdens; and where appropriate provide direct assistance in the form of specialist advice and support and easing access to finance.

My Department supports the DTI's small business measures and initiatives. I am the Minister within this Department for small businesses and I attend or am represented at the DTI's regular meetings.

The Defence Suppliers Service assists companies, including small businesses, in making contact with appropriate contracts branches. It also arranges for details of many forthcoming tenders to be published in the fortnightly MOD *Contracts Bulletin* which is available to my interested party on subscription. This enables small businesses either to seek to tender directly for specific requirements or, more commonly, to become sub-contractors to larger companies.

Since the Procurement Executive of the Ministry of Defence moved to the new procurement headquarters at Abbey Wood near Bristol earlier this year, the Defence Suppliers Service is in contact with the Bristol chamber of commerce and DTI's business links, whose South-west regional supply network office has become their national focal point for the defence industry. Other areas of the country can reach my Department, and be reached by us, through the business links network.

As much of the assistance provided by my Department to small businesses tends to be in the sub-contractor sector, it is not possible to establish suitable performance parameters and therefore no statistics are available.

Rendlesham Forest (Incident)

Mr. Redmond: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence (1) what response his Department made to the report submitted by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt

relating to events in Rendlesham forest in December 1980; what interviews were held; and if he will make a statement; (39247)

(2) who assessed that the events around RAF Woodbridge and RAF Bentwaters in December 1980, which were reported to his Department by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt were of no defence significance; on what evidence the assessment was made; what analysis of events was carried out; and if he will make a statement. (39249)

Mr. Soames: The report was assessed by the staff in my Department responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgment was that it contained nothing of defence significance no further action was taken.

Uncorrelated Radar Tracks (Investigations)

Mr. Redmond: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence on how many occasions RAF aircraft have been (a) scrambled and (b) diverted from task to investigate uncorrelated targets picked up on radar; and if he will make a statement. (39218)

Mr. Soames: In the past five years RAF aircraft have been scrambled or diverted from task on two occasions to intercept and identify uncorrelated radar tracks entering the United Kingdom air defence region.

Unidentified Craft

Mr. Redmond: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence (1) what is his Department's assessment of the incident that occurred on 5 November 1990 when a patrol of RAF Tornado aircraft flying over the North sea were overtaken at high speed by an unidentified craft; and if he will make a statement; (39245)

(2) if he will make a statement on the unidentified flying object sighting reported to his Department by the meteorological officer at RAF Shawbury in the early hours of 31 March 1993. (39246)

Mr. Soames: Reports of sightings on these dates are recorded on file and were examined by staff responsible for air defence matters. No firm conclusions were drawn about the nature of the phenomena reported but the events were not judged to be of defence significance.

Mr. Redmond: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence what assessment his Department made of the photograph of an unidentified craft at Calvine on 4 August 1990; who removed it from an office in secretariat (air staff) 2a; for what reasons; and if he will make a statement. (39248)

Mr. Soames: A number of negatives associated with the sighting were examined by staff responsible for air defence matters. Since it was judged that they contained nothing of defence significance the negatives were not retained and we have no record of any photographs having been taken from them.

Publicity

Ms Hodge: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence what is his Department's budget in 1996-97 for consultants to assist with information, publicity, press and media. (39353)

RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
TEMPORARY ENCLOSURE JACKET

MOD Form 174D
 (Revised 5/99)

31

<p align="right">REGISTERED FILE No.</p> <p align="center" style="font-size: 1.5em;">D/DAS(SEC) 69/19</p> <p align="right">Enclosure Jacket No 7</p> <p>DATE OPENED (Date of First Enclosure) 16 JANUARY 2001</p>	<p>DIVISION / DIRECTORATE / BRANCH:</p> <p align="center" style="font-size: 1.5em;">DAS(SEC)</p>		
<p>SUBJECT: PQ 0318L LORD HILL - NORTON REPLY TO BARONESS SYMONS</p>			
Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date

USER NOTES

1. A MOD Form 262A (File Record Sheet) must be raised for each new Temporary Enclosure Jacket (TEJ) created. The TEJ should also include a minute sheet.
2. When a TEJ is incorporated into the parent file it should be placed in the file in date order (according to the date of the last action on the TEJ) and allocated an enclosure number.
3. The file minute sheet should be annotated to record the enclosure number of the TEJ along with details of the number of enclosures contained within it. The TEJ record sheet (MOD Form 262A) should be annotated to record the date on which the TEJ was incorporated into the parent file (JSP 441, paragraph 4.13 refers).

RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED

TEMPLATE TO BE USED FOR REPLY

FILE

4

Ministry of Defence

FRIDAY 26 JANUARY 2001

Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB(X) (CB)

LORDS WRITTEN

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether personnel from Porton Down visited Rendlesham Forest or the area surrounding RAF Walton in December 1980 or January 1981; and whether they are aware of any tests carried out in either of those two areas aimed at assessing any nuclear, biological or chemical hazard. (HL301)

Minister replying Baroness Symons

The staff at the Defence Evaluation and Research Agency (DERA) Chemical and Biological Defence (CBD) laboratories at Porton Down have made a thorough search of their archives and have found no record of any such visits.

18 January 01

PQ Ref 0348L

LORDS WRITTEN PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION - URGENT ACTION REQUIRED

DATE FOR RETURN : 12:00 ON 18 January 2001
PQ REFERENCE : PQ 0348L
PQ TYPE : LORDS WRITTEN
MINISTER REPLYING : -NOTFOUND-

LEAD BRANCH: :
COPY ADDRESSEE(S) :
DAS(SEC)
DI(Sec)
GVIU
D SEF POL
D NEWS

DERA

3
- supply with
background
"The Bomb" - RF
incident.

- The answer and background note must be authorised by a civil servant at Senior Civil Service level or a military officer at one-star level or above who is responsible for ensuring that the information and advice provided is accurate and reflects Departmental Instructions on answering PQs DCI GEN 150/97.
- Those contributing information for PQ answers and background notes are responsible for ensuring the information is accurate.
- The attached checklist should be used by those drafting PQ answers and background material, those contributing information and those responsible for authorising the answer and background note as an aid to ensuring that departmental policy is adhered to.
- If you or others concerned are uncertain about how PQs are answered seek advice from a senior civil servant in or closely associated with your area.

Peer's DETAIL: Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB

QUESTION

To ask Her Majesty's Government To ask Her Majesty's Government whether personnel from Porton Down visited Rendlesham Forest or the area surrounding RAF Walton in December 1980 or January 1981; and whether they are aware of any carried out in either of those two areas aimed at assessing any nuclear, biological or chemical hazard. (HL301)

miss-g
word - probably "test"

MINISTRY OF
DEFENCE
12 JAN 2001

Fax Message

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Documents protected above restricted may not be sent. Restricted documents without a caveat may be sent to UK mainland addresses only.

Directorate of Corporate Affairs,
Cody Building, Ively Road,
Farnborough, GU14 0LX

2

To (recipient's name): [REDACTED]	
Department or company: DAS	
From (sender's name): [REDACTED]	Authorised signature: [REDACTED]
Fax number: [REDACTED]	Tel number: [REDACTED]
Recipient's fax number: [REDACTED]	Number of pages including this sheet: 2+1
Copied to:	
Date: 18/1/01	Protective marking and descriptor of material:
Document date:	Document Reference:
<p>Message:</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p><u>PQ 0348L</u></p> <p>Draft answer and background note attached. This has not gone to Parliamentary Branch.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	

NOTICE: This communication may contain information which is commercial-in-confidence and/or legally privileged and is intended only for the addressee named above. If you are not the named addressee, the communication has been sent to you in error. Any copying, distribution or other use of the information is strictly prohibited. We should be grateful if you would contact us immediately so that we can arrange for its return.

If this fax is incomplete, please telephone this number immediately: [REDACTED]

Ministry of Defence

Fri 26 January 2001

Admiral of the Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB(X) CB

LORDS WRITTEN

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether personnel from Porton Down visited Rendlesham Forest or the area surrounding RAF Walton in December 1980 or January 1981; and whether they are aware of any carried out in either of those two areas aimed at assessing any nuclear, biological or chemical hazard. (HL301)

Minister replying Baroness Symons

The staff at the Defence Evaluation and Research Agency (DERA) Chemical and Biological Defence (CBD) laboratories at Porton Down have made a thorough search of their archives but have been unable to find any records of such visits taking place.

January 01

PQ Ref 0348L

Background to PQ Ref No: **REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**

This is one of several PQs raised by Lord Hill-Norton, the answers to which, including this one, are being coordinated by the Directorate of Air Staff. The questions are believed to have been prompted by a recently published book on the Rendlesham Forest incident about an alleged UFO sighting.

Staff at DERA Porton Down have searched records for details of this incident and also made enquiries with some of the very few existing members of staff who were working at Porton Down at that time. No information about this incident has been found.

Drafted by: [REDACTED] Directorate of Corporate Affairs, DERA, Farnborough
Tel: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]

Approved by: [REDACTED] Director Corporate Affairs, DERA, Farnborough
Tel: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



From: [REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Directorate of Air Staff 4a1 (Secretariat)
[REDACTED] Main Building, Whitehall
LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) [REDACTED]
(Switchboard) [REDACTED]
(Fax) [REDACTED]

FAX MESSAGE

Phone:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Fax:

[REDACTED]

TO: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: PQ 0348L

DATE: 16 January 2001

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 7

[REDACTED]

Sorry about the delay but Lord Hill Norton has now tabled a further two PQs on this subject that diverted our attention slightly.

Please find attached a background note, a copy of the acknowledgements from a recently published book on the Rendlesham Forest incident (thanking Lord Hill-Norton) and extracts from the book which mention possible involvement of Porton Down personnel.

I hope this helps. Please let me know if there is anything else we can help with.

[REDACTED]

BACKGROUND NOTE

1. . . . Lord Hill-Norton has tabled five other PQs on the subject of material contained in a book by Georgina Bruni published in November 2000 and MOD handling of material relating to 'UFOs'. Three are being answered by MOD, one by the Home Office and one is to be answered by (DERA). Miss Bruni's book, "You can't tell the people" concerns a well known 'UFO' incident alleged to have occurred in Rendlesham Forest in Suffolk over the Christmas period in 1980 in the vicinity of two RAF bases at that time on lease to the USAF, RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge.

2. The subject of the incident said to have taken place in Rendlesham Forest came to prominence in 1983 when a memorandum sent to MOD shortly after the event by the then Deputy Base Commander, Lt Col Charles Halt USAF, was unearthed in the US by researchers. The Halt memorandum describes the alleged incident in some detail and is reprinted in the book where claims are also made that USAF personnel met and communicated with "beings". The book accuses the UK establishment of a "cover-up" to hide the detail of the alleged event in Rendlesham Forest. Text of correspondence on the subject between a retired Chief of Defence Staff, Lord Hill-Norton, and a previous MOD Minister is reprinted in the book.

3. MOD's interest in 'UFO's' is limited to whether alleged sightings might have any defence significance; namely, if they provide evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace may have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is corroborating evidence to suggest that the UK's airspace may have been compromised, MOD does not investigate or seek to provide a precise explanation for each of the 'UFO' letters and reported sightings received each year. MOD believes that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for most of the sightings. However, it is not the function of MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service and resources are not diverted for this purpose.

known civilians to hear
1999. © *Georgina Bruni*
ral Petr S. Deynekin, the
Air Force (centre), and
r Chief of Staff of the
ion circa 1996. *Courtesy*

RAF Bentwaters (1999).

l for training purposes),

RAF Woodbridge, taken
anuary 1981). © *Adrian*

sites (1999). © *Georgina*

9). © *Georgina Bruni*
ling site showing barren

d Captain Mike Verrano
orning after the incident

wing the scuffed-up area
three indentations in a
gs (26 December 1980).

: (26 December 1980).

ving indentation marked
ulyas

ving indentation marked
ulyas

ving indentation marked
ulyas

officer and Captain Mike
v Ray Gulyas

s at RAF Woodbridge/

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book has only been made possible thanks to a great many people. I am deeply indebted to my agent, Andrew Lownie, for his encouragement, support and efforts. My thanks also to my editor Gordon Scott Wise, Editorial Director at Sidgwick and Jackson, for his enthusiasm and patience and for helping me to turn this extraordinary, complex case into a valuable casebook. To Nick Pope for contributing the foreword, for advising me on the best way to obtain government documents and for his precious contributions. To my parents, family and friends for their understanding of my isolation whilst working on this investigation.

This story could not have been told without the generous assistance of the witnesses and many people who have played an important role in these strange events. I am especially grateful to Major General Gordon E. Williams USAF (ret.) for his patience and contributions and allowing me to interview him in person. To former Special Agent Wayne Persinger, Deputy Commander, Air Force Office of Special Investigations (Bentwaters), USAF (ret.), for his contributions. To Colonel Sam P. Morgan USAF (ret.), for providing me with the first copy of the 'Halt Tape'. To Ray Gulyas USAF (ret.) and his wife Maryann, for their contributions and for leading me to the original photographs of the initial landing site. I am grateful to all these men and women for allowing me to interview them and for assisting me with my enquires: Rick Bobo USAF (ret.), Lieutenant Colonel Fred 'Skip' Buran USAF (ret.), Adrian Bustinza USAF (ret.), Tony Brisciano USAF, Edward N. Cabansag USAF (ret.), Gary Collins, Lieutenant Colonel Bernard E.

TEMPLATE TO BE USED FOR REPLY

2

Ministry of Defence

FRIDAY 26 JANUARY 2001

Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB(X) (CB)

LORDS WRITTEN

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they are aware of any investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident carried out by the United States Air Force, the Air Force Office of Special Investigations or any other United States agency. (HL322)

Minister replying Baroness Symons

The Ministry of Defence's knowledge of an investigation by the US authorities into the alleged incident in Rendlesham Forest in 1980 is limited to the information contained in the memorandum sent by Lt Col Halt USAF, Deputy Base Commander at RAF Woodbridge, to the RAF Liaison Officer at RAF Bentwaters on 13 January 1981.

January 01

PQ Ref 0355L

LORDS WRITTEN PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION - URGENT ACTION REQUIRED

Lead

DATE FOR RETURN : 12:00 ON 29 January 2001
 PQ REFERENCE : PQ 0355L
 PQ TYPE : LORDS WRITTEN
 MINISTER REPLYING : -NOTFOUND-

LEAD BRANCH: : SEC (AS)
 COPY ADDRESSEE(S) :
 MDP Sec
 D NEWS
 CAS
 ACAS

*Info from
 DAS 3.doc.*

- The answer and background note must be authorised by a civil servant at Senior Civil Service level or a military officer at one-star level or above who is responsible for ensuring that the information and advice provided is accurate and reflects Departmental Instructions on answering PQs DCI GEN 150/97.
- Those contributing information for PQ answers and background notes are responsible for ensuring the information is accurate.
- The attached checklist should be used by those drafting PQ answers and background material, those contributing information and those responsible for authorising the answer and background note as an aid to ensuring that departmental policy is adhered to.
- If you or others concerned are uncertain about how PQs are answered seek advice from a senior civil servant in or closely associated with your area.

Peer's DETAIL: Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB

QUESTION

✓ To ask Her Majesty's Government To ask Her Majesty's Government ~~whether they are aware of any~~ investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident ~~carried out by the United States Air Force, the~~ Air Force Office of Special Investigations or any other United States agency. (HL322)

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 DAS 3 (SEC)
 16 JAN 2001
 FILE _____

(DRAFT answer to P03551 - Admiral of The Fleet Lord Hill-Norton, CGB)

DAS3 (Jee)
Contact with
reply and background
note. Text cleared
with USAF.

Question: To ask HMG whether they are aware of any investigation of the 1980 Rendlesham Forest incident carried out by the United States Air Force, the Air Force Office of Special Investigations or any other United States agency.

Answer: "The only evidence of investigation by the US authorities into the alleged incident in Rendlesham Forest in 1980 of which MOD is aware is contained in the memorandum sent by Lt Col Halt USAF, Deputy Base Commander at RAF Woodbridge, to the RAF Liaison Officer at RAF Bentwaters on 13 January 1981."

(Insert for PQ 0355L - Background material)

The MOD file on the alleged incident in Rendlesham Forest in 1980 (D/Sec(AS)/12/2/1) claims to have been opened as a registered file on 25 October 1982. However, as Sec(AS) did not exist until towards the end of 1984, or early in 1985 it is impossible to be certain when the file was actually created. An examination of the file that took place in 1998 confirmed that many of the papers it contained had been removed from their original location. The file cannot, therefore, be regarded with any degree of certainty as a full record of all papers available to MOD on the event that ever existed. A mention in a file note written in October 1983 to an unclassified USAF report is likely to be a reference to the "Halt memorandum" (Annex). The handwritten note also records that the US authorities did not carry out investigations (conducting interviews of personnel) but left MOD to carry out any inquiries it felt necessary.

When the Ministry of Defence was informed of the events which are alleged to have occurred at Rendlesham Forest in December 1980, all available substantiated evidence was looked at in the usual manner by those within the MOD/RAF with responsibility for air defence matters. The judgement was that there was no indication that a breach of the United Kingdom's air defences had occurred on the nights in question. As there was no evidence to substantiate an event of defence concern no further investigation into the matter was necessary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS 81ST COMSAS SUPPORT GROUP (USAF)
APO NEW YORK 09755




REPLY TO
ATTN OF: CD

13 Jun 81

SUBJECT: Unexplained Lights

TO: RAF/CC

1. Early in the morning of 27 Dec 80 (approximately 0300L), two USAF security police patrolmen saw unusual lights outside the back gate at RAF Woodbridge. Thinking an aircraft might have crashed or been forced down, they called for permission to go outside the gate to investigate. The on-duty flight chief responded and allowed three patrolmen to proceed on foot. The individuals reported seeing a strange glowing object in the forest. The object was described as being metallic in appearance and triangular in shape, approximately two to three meters across the base and approximately two meters high. It illuminated the entire forest with a white light. The object itself had a pulsing red light on top and a bank(s) of blue lights underneath. The object was hovering or on legs. As the patrolmen approached the object, it maneuvered through the trees and disappeared. At this time the animals on a nearby farm went into a frenzy. The object was briefly sighted approximately an hour later near the back gate.
2. The next day, three depressions 1 1/2" deep and 7" in diameter were found where the object had been sighted on the ground. The following night (29 Dec 80) the area was checked for radiation. Beta/gamma readings of 0.1 milliroentgens were recorded with peak readings in the three depressions and near the center of the triangle formed by the depressions. A nearby tree had moderate (.05-.07) readings on the side of the tree toward the depressions.
3. Later in the night a red sun-like light was seen through the trees. It moved about and pulsed. At one point it appeared to throw off glowing particles and then broke into five separate white objects and then disappeared. Immediately thereafter, three star-like objects were noticed in the sky, two objects to the north and one to the south, all of which were about 10° off the horizon. The objects moved rapidly in sharp angular movements and displayed red, green and blue lights. The objects to the north appeared to be elliptical through an 8-12 power lens. They then turned to full circles. The objects to the north remained in the sky for an hour or more. The object to the south was visible for two or three hours and beamed down a stream of light from time to time. Numerous individuals, including the undersigned, witnessed the activities in paragraphs 2 and 3.


CHARLES I. HALT, Lt Col, USAF
Deputy Base Commander

RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
TEMPORARY ENCLOSURE JACKET

MOD Form 174D
 (Revised 5/99)

31

REGISTERED FILE No. D/DAS (SEC) 64/19		DIVISION / DIRECTORATE / BRANCH: DAS (SEC)	
Enclosure Jacket No 7			
DATE OPENED (Date of First Enclosure) 16 JANUARY 2001			
SUBJECT: PQ 0348L LORD HILL - NORTON REPLY TO BARONESS SYMONS			
Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date

USER NOTES

1. A MOD Form 262A (File Record Sheet) must be raised for each new Temporary Enclosure Jacket (TEJ) created. The TEJ should also include a minute sheet.
2. When a TEJ is incorporated into the parent file it should be placed in the file in date order (according to the date of the last action on the TEJ) and allocated an enclosure number.
3. The file minute sheet should be annotated to record the enclosure number of the TEJ along with details of the number of enclosures contained within it. The TEJ record sheet (MOD Form 262A) should be annotated to record the date on which the TEJ was incorporated into the parent file (JSP 441, paragraph 4.13 refers).

RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED

TEMPLATE TO BE USED FOR REPLY

FILE 4

Ministry of Defence

FRIDAY 26 JANUARY 2001

Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB(X) (CB)

LORDS WRITTEN

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether personnel from Porton Down visited Rendlesham Forest or the area surrounding RAF Walton in December 1980 or January 1981; and whether they are aware of any tests carried out in either of those two areas aimed at assessing any nuclear, biological or chemical hazard. (HL301)

Minister replying Baroness Symons

The staff at the Defence Evaluation and Research Agency (DERA) Chemical and Biological Defence (CBD) laboratories at Porton Down have made a thorough search of their archives and have found no record of any such visits.

18 January 01

PQ Ref 0348L

LORDS WRITTEN PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION - URGENT ACTION REQUIRED

DATE FOR RETURN : 12:00 ON 18 January 2001
PQ REFERENCE : PQ 0348L
PQ TYPE : LORDS WRITTEN
MINISTER REPLYING : -NOTFOUND-

LEAD BRANCH: :
COPY ADDRESSEE(S) :
DAS(SEC)
DI(Sec)
GVIU
D SEF POL
D NEWS

DERA

3
- supply with
background
"The Bath" - RF
incdnt.

- The answer and background note must be authorised by a civil servant at Senior Civil Service level or a military officer at one-star level or above who is responsible for ensuring that the information and advice provided is accurate and reflects Departmental Instructions on answering PQs DCI GEN 150/97.
- Those contributing information for PQ answers and background notes are responsible for ensuring the information is accurate.
- The attached checklist should be used by those drafting PQ answers and background material, those contributing information and those responsible for authorising the answer and background note as an aid to ensuring that departmental policy is adhered to.
- If you or others concerned are uncertain about how PQs are answered seek advice from a senior civil servant in or closely associated with your area.

Peer's DETAIL: Admiral of The Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB

QUESTION

To ask Her Majesty's Government To ask Her Majesty's Government whether personnel from Porton Down visited Rendlesham Forest or the area surrounding RAF Walton in December 1980 or January 1981; and whether they are aware of any/carried out in either of those two areas aimed at assessing any nuclear, biological or chemical hazard. (HL301)

missing
word - probably "tests"

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
12 JAN 2001

DERA

Fax Message

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Documents protected above restricted may not be sent. Restricted documents without a caveat may be sent to UK mainland addresses only.

Directorate of Corporate Affairs,
Cody Building, Ively Road,
Farnborough, GU14 0LX

2

To (recipient's name): [REDACTED]	
Department or company: <u>DAS</u>	
From (sender's name): [REDACTED]	Authorised signature: [REDACTED]
Fax number: [REDACTED]	Tel number: [REDACTED]
Recipient's fax number: [REDACTED]	Number of pages including this sheet: <u>2+1</u>
Copied to:	
Date: <u>18/1/01</u>	Protective marking and descriptor of material:
Document date:	Document Reference:

Message:

[REDACTED]

PQ 0848L

Draft answer and background note attached. This has not gone to Parliamentary Branch.

Regards

[REDACTED]

NOTICE: This communication may contain information which is commercial-in-confidence and/or legally privileged and is intended only for the addressee named above. If you are not the named addressee, the communication has been sent to you in error. Any copying, distribution or other use of the information is strictly prohibited. We should be grateful if you would contact us immediately so that we can arrange for its return.

If this fax is incomplete, please telephone this number immediately: [REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Ministry of Defence

Fri 26 January 2001

Admiral of the Fleet The Lord Hill-Norton GCB(X) CB

LORDS WRITTEN

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether personnel from Porton Down visited Rendlesham Forest or the area surrounding RAF Walton in December 1980 or January 1981; and whether they are aware of any carried out in either of those two areas aimed at assessing any nuclear, biological or chemical hazard. (HL301)

Minister replying Baroness Symons

The staff at the Defence Evaluation and Research Agency (DERA) Chemical and Biological Defence (CBD) laboratories at Porton Down have made a thorough search of their archives but have been unable to find any records of such visits taking place.

January 01

PQ Ref 0348L

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Background to PQ Ref No: 0348L

This is one of several PQs raised by Lord Hill-Norton, the answers to which, including this one, are being coordinated by the Directorate of Air Staff. The questions are believed to have been prompted by a recently published book on the Rendlesham Forest incident about an alleged UFO sighting.

Staff at DERA Porton Down have searched records for details of this incident and also made enquiries with some of the very few existing members of staff who were working at Porton Down at that time. No information about this incident has been found.

Drafted by: [REDACTED] Directorate of Corporate Affairs, DERA, Farnborough
Tel: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]

Approved by: [REDACTED] Director Corporate Affairs, DERA, Farnborough
Tel: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



From: [REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Directorate of Air Staff 4a1 (Secretariat)
[REDACTED], Main Building, Whitehall
LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) [REDACTED]
(Switchboard) [REDACTED]
(Fax) [REDACTED]

FAX MESSAGE

Phone:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Fax:

[REDACTED]

TO: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: PQ 0348L

DATE: 16 January 2001

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 7

[REDACTED]

Sorry about the delay but Lord Hill Norton has now tabled a further two PQs on this subject that diverted our attention slightly.

Please find attached a background note, a copy of the acknowledgements from a recently published book on the Rendlesham Forest incident (thanking Lord Hill-Norton) and extracts from the book which mention possible involvement of Porton Down personnel.

I hope this helps. Please let me know if there is anything else we can help with.

[REDACTED]

BACKGROUND NOTE

1. . . . Lord Hill-Norton has tabled five other PQs on the subject of material contained in a book by Georgina Bruni published in November 2000 and MOD handling of material relating to 'UFOs'. Three are being answered by MOD, one by the Home Office and one is to be answered by (DERA). Miss Bruni's book, "You can't tell the people" concerns a well known 'UFO' incident alleged to have occurred in Rendlesham Forest in Suffolk over the Christmas period in 1980 in the vicinity of two RAF bases at that time on lease to the USAF, RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge.
2. The subject of the incident said to have taken place in Rendlesham Forest came to prominence in 1983 when a memorandum sent to MOD shortly after the event by the then Deputy Base Commander, Lt Col Charles Halt USAF, was unearthed in the US by researchers. The Halt memorandum describes the alleged incident in some detail and is reprinted in the book where claims are also made that USAF personnel met and communicated with "beings". The book accuses the UK establishment of a "cover-up" to hide the detail of the alleged event in Rendlesham Forest. Text of correspondence on the subject between a retired Chief of Defence Staff, Lord Hill-Norton, and a previous MOD Minister is reprinted in the book.
3. MOD's interest in 'UFO's' is limited to whether alleged sightings might have any defence significance; namely, if they provide evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace may have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is corroborating evidence to suggest that the UK's airspace may have been compromised, MOD does not investigate or seek to provide a precise explanation for each of the 'UFO' letters and reported sightings received each year. MOD believes that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for most of the sightings. However, it is not the function of MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service and resources are not diverted for this purpose.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

known civilians to hear
1999. © *Georgina Bruni*
ral Petr S. Deynekin, the
Air Force (centre), and
r Chief of Staff of the
ion circa 1996. *Courtesy*

RAF Bentwaters (1999).

i for training purposes),

RAF Woodbridge, taken
anuary 1981). © *Adrian*

sites (1999). © *Georgina*

9). © *Georgina Bruni*
ling site showing barren

d Captain Mike Verrano
orning after the incident

wing the scuffed-up area
three indentations in a
gs (26 December 1980).

: (26 December 1980).

wing indentation marked
ulyas

wing indentation marked
ulyas

wing indentation marked
ulyas

fficer and Captain Mike
v Ray Gulyas

s at RAF Woodbridge/

This book has only been made possible thanks to a great many people. I am deeply indebted to my agent, Andrew Lownie, for his encouragement, support and efforts. My thanks also to my editor Gordon Scott Wise, Editorial Director at Sidgwick and Jackson, for his enthusiasm and patience and for helping me to turn this extraordinary, complex case into a valuable casebook. To Nick Pope for contributing the foreword, for advising me on the best way to obtain government documents and for his precious contributions. To my parents, family and friends for their understanding of my isolation whilst working on this investigation.

This story could not have been told without the generous assistance of the witnesses and many people who have played an important role in these strange events. I am especially grateful to Major General Gordon E. Williams USAF (ret.) for his patience and contributions and allowing me to interview him in person. To former Special Agent Wayne Persinger, Deputy Commander, Air Force Office of Special Investigations (Bentwaters), USAF (ret.), for his contributions. To Colonel Sam P. Morgan USAF (ret.), for providing me with the first copy of the 'Halt Tape'. To Ray Gulyas USAF (ret.) and his wife Maryann, for their contributions and for leading me to the original photographs of the initial landing site. I am grateful to all these men and women for allowing me to interview them and for assisting me with my enquires: Rick Bobo USAF (ret.), Lieutenant Colonel Fred 'Skip' Buran USAF (ret.), Adrian Bustinza USAF (ret.), Tony Brisciano USAF, Edward N. Cabansag USAF (ret.), Gary Collins, Lieutenant Colonel Bernard E.

Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt: Memorandum

Lord Hill-Norton asked Her Majesty's Government:

Whether the Ministry of Defence replied to the 1981 memorandum from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt, which reported the presence of an unidentified craft that had landed in close proximity to RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge, witnessed by United States Air Force personnel; and if not, why not; and

How the radiation readings reported to the Ministry of Defence by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt in his memorandum dated 13 January 1981 compare to the normal levels of background radiation in Rendelsham Forest.

Lord Gilbert: The memorandum, which reported observations of unusual lights in the sky, was assessed by staff in the MoD responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgment was that it contained nothing of defence significance, no further action was taken.

There is no record of any official assessment of the radiation readings reported by Lieutenant Colonel Halt. From a Defence perspective some 16½ years after the alleged events, there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment now.

Joint Services Command and Staff College

Lord Kennet asked Her Majesty's Government:

Whether the site at Camberley, in favour of which the Greenwich site was rejected for the JSCSC, is to be cleared of asbestos, and, if so, at what cost; why was the presence of asbestos not ascertained before plans to move the JSCSC there were finalised and then changed; and what plans do the Ministry of Defence have for the Camberley site once it has been cleared of asbestos; and

Why, given that the consultation document on the future location of the JSCSC that was issued in January 1995 did not address the possibility of setting the college up on a greenfield site, there has been no consultation on the Shrivenham option; and

What is the anticipated total cost of the interim accommodation for the JSCSC until the work on Shrivenham is completed, and what date is being required for completion; and

Whether the anticipated overall cost to the taxpayer of the PFI scheme currently being considered for the new site of the JSCSC will be declared to Parliament; and

Further to the Written Answers by Lord Gilbert on 21 July (WA 147-148) on the future of the Joint Services Command and Staff College (JSCSC), whether apart from the provision of married accommodation, the Greenwich site would be at least £200 million cheaper than accommodation at the proposed greenfield site at Shrivenham; and whether the cost of the Shrivenham site is expected to be around £500 million.

Lord Gilbert: I am advised that the asbestos identified at the Camberley site presents no threat to health if left undisturbed. Its removal would be required if buildings were to be demolished, which was the case when the JSCSC was to have been based at Camberley. At that stage it was estimated that survey and removal together would cost no more than £87K. The presence of asbestos was not the reason for exploring a PFI solution for the JSCSC. Until a decision is reached on the future use of the Camberley site, it is not clear whether action will be needed to deal with the asbestos. It remains our intention to identify a fitting and appropriate military use for the historic Staff College building at Camberley and work is currently under way to this end.

Although the January 1995 Consultative Document did not consider greenfield sites for the permanent JSCSC, for the reasons given in paragraph 9 of the Document, the two further Consultative Documents of March 1996 and July 1996 indicated, inter alia, that interim arrangements would last for two years, that proposals for the permanent site would be dealt with separately, and that work in hand "to determine the best way of providing (a permanent JSCSC), on a site yet to be identified, includes a development under Private Finance Initiative (PFI) arrangements". Since then, the trades unions have been informed of the choice of a PFI Preferred Bidder and provided with extracts from the Invitation To Negotiate which are currently under discussion. In accordance with normal procedures, staff will be consulted again, after a contract has been placed, about the possible transfer arrangements for civilian staff working at interim sites.

The anticipated total cost of the JSCSC in its interim accommodation is approximately £70 million over the period 1996-97 to 1999-2000. The required completion date for the permanent JSCSC, as given in the published Statement of Requirement, is September 1999.

The estimated total, undiscounted and VAT inclusive, cost of the PFI contract over a 30-year period is approximately £500 million at current prices. This information was widely reported at the time of the announcement of the Preferred Bidder, and given out in another place on 26 February in response to a specific question. This estimate excludes the ongoing costs of MoD-provided teaching and directing staff of around £10 million per annum.

The last time that Greenwich costs were subjected to formal assessment was around the end of 1994. The results of this assessment were published in the Consultative Document of January 1995. These showed the Greenwich option, leaving aside the cost of providing the necessary married accommodation, to be more than 25 per cent. more expensive than the Camberley option. There is no evidence to suggest that, if the costs of the Greenwich option were revisited, they would prove anything other than significantly more expensive than both the Camberley option and the Preferred Shrivenham Bid submitted in the course of the PFI competition.



- The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Ministry of Defence replied to the 1981 memorandum from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt, which reported the presence of an unidentified craft that had landed in close proximity to RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge, witnessed by United States Air Force personnel; and if not, why not. [31st July]
- The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government how the radiation readings reported to the Ministry of Defence by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt in his memorandum dated 13th January 1981 compare to the normal levels of background radiation in Rendelsham Forest. [31st July]

A N S W E R

(The Lord Gilbert)

The memorandum, which reported observations of unusual lights in the sky, was assessed by staff in the MOD responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgment was that it contained nothing of defence significance no further action was taken.

There is no record of any official assessment of the radiation readings reported by Lieutenant Colonel Halt. From a Defence perspective, some 16½ years after the alleged events, there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment now.

Section 40

Ministry of Defence

12 September 1997

08611/08621



Minister

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Content?

Minister

Content?

30/8

2/8

The Lord Hill-Norton -

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Ministry of Defence replied to the 1981 memorandum from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt, which reported the presence of an unidentified craft that had landed in close proximity to RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge, witnessed by United States Air Force personnel; and if not, why not. [31st July]

The Lord Hill-Norton -

To ask Her Majesty's Government how the radiation readings reported to the Ministry of Defence by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt in his memorandum dated 13th January 1981 compare to the normal levels of background radiation in Rendelsham Forest. [31st July]

A N S W E R

(The Lord Gilbert)

The memorandum, which reported observations of unusual lights in the sky, was assessed by staff in ^{the MoD} ~~my~~ Department responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgement was that it contained nothing of defence significance no further action was taken.

There is no record of any official assessment of the radiation readings reported by Lieutenant Colonel Halt. From a Defence perspective, some 16½ years after the alleged events, there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment now.

Ministry of Defence

August 1997

08611/08621

PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION - URGENT ACTION REQUIRED

DATE FOR RETURN : **12:00 ON WEDNESDAY 13 AUGUST 1997**

PQ REFERENCE : **PQ 0862i and PQ 0861i**
PQ TYPE : **Written**
SUPPLEMENTARIES REQUIRED? : **No**

MINISTER REPLYING : **MINISTER OF STATE FOR DEFENCE PROCUREMENT**

LEAD BRANCH: : **SEC(AS)**
COPY ADDRESSEE(S) :

QUESTION

PQ 0862i: The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Ministry of Defence replied to the 1981 memorandum from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt, which reported the presence of an unidentified craft that had landed in close proximity to RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge, witnessed by United States Air Force personnel, and, if not, why not. [31st July]

PQ 0861i: The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government how the radiation readings reported to the Ministry of Defence by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt in his memorandum dated 13th January 1981 compare to the normal levels of background radiation in Rendelsham Forest. [31st July]

ANSWER

The memorandum, which reported observations of unusual lights in the sky, was assessed by staff in my Department responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgement was that it contained nothing of defence significance no further action was taken.

There is no record of any official assessment of the radiation readings reported by Lieutenant Colonel Halt. From a Defence perspective, some 16½ years after the alleged events, there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment now.

Pat Barnes

Oh

157 p

- The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Ministry of Defence replied to the 1981 memorandum from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt, which reported the presence of an unidentified craft that had landed in close proximity to RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge, witnessed by United States Air Force personnel; and if not, why not. [31st July]
- The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government how the radiation readings reported to the Ministry of Defence by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt in his memorandum dated 13th January 1981 compare to the normal levels of background radiation in Rendelsham Forest. [31st July]

A N S W E R

(The Lord Gilbert)

The memorandum, which reported observations of unusual lights in the sky, was assessed by staff in my Department responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgement was that it contained nothing of defence significance no further action was taken.

There is no record of any official assessment of the radiation readings reported by Lieutenant Colonel Halt. From a Defence perspective, some 16½ years after the alleged events, there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment now.

Ministry of Defence

August 1997

08611/08621

PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION - URGENT ACTION REQUIRED

DATE FOR RETURN : **12:00 ON WEDNESDAY 13 AUGUST**
1997

PQ REFERENCE : **PQ 0862i and PQ 0861i**
PQ TYPE : **Written**
SUPPLEMENTARIES REQUIRED? : **No**

MINISTER REPLYING : **MINISTER OF STATE FOR DEFENCE**
PROCUREMENT

LEAD BRANCH: : **SEC(AS)**
COPY ADDRESSEE(S) :

QUESTION

PQ 0862i: The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Ministry of Defence replied to the 1981 memorandum from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt, which reported the presence of an unidentified craft that had landed in close proximity to RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge, witnessed by United States Air Force personnel, and, if not, why not. [31st July]

PQ 0861i: The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government how the radiation readings reported to the Ministry of Defence by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt in his memorandum dated 13th January 1981 compare to the normal levels of background radiation in Rendelsham Forest. [31st July]

ANSWER

The memorandum, which reported observations of unusual lights in the sky, was assessed by staff in my Department responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgement was that it contained nothing of defence significance no further action was taken.

There is no record of any official assessment of the radiation readings reported by Lieutenant Colonel Halt. From a Defence perspective, some 16½ years after the alleged events, there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment now.

- The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Ministry of Defence replied to the 1981 memorandum from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt, which reported the presence of an unidentified craft that had landed in close proximity to RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge, witnessed by United States Air Force personnel; and if not, why not. [31st July]
- The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government how the radiation readings reported to the Ministry of Defence by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt in his memorandum dated 13th January 1981 compare to the normal levels of background radiation in Rendelsham Forest. [31st July]

A N S W E R

(The Lord Gilbert)

The memorandum, which reported observations of unusual lights in the sky, was assessed by staff in my Department responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgement was that it contained nothing of defence significance no further action was taken.

There is no record of any official assessment of the radiation readings reported by Lieutenant Colonel Halt. From a Defence perspective, some 16½ years after the alleged events, there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment now.

Ministry of Defence

August 1997

08611/08621

DRAFTED BY : [REDACTED]

TEL: [REDACTED]

AUTHORISED BY : [REDACTED]

TEL: [REDACTED]

GRADE/RANK : Grade 7

AUTHORISED BY : [REDACTED]

TEL: [REDACTED]

GRADE/RANK : SCS

DECLARATION: I have satisfied myself that the following answer and background note are in accordance with the Government's policy on answering PQs, Departmental instructions (DCI {To Be Confirmed}), and the Open Government Code (DCI GEN 48/97).

[REDACTED]

BACKGROUND NOTE:

1. Lord Hill-Norton has a long-standing interest in "UFOs", was a member of the (now defunct) House of Lords All-Party "UFO" Study Group, and has written forewords for two books on the subject. He has previously written to Ministers supporting individual "ufologist" causes.
 2. The MOD position on "UFO" sightings is that we examine any reports received solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the UK Air Defence Region might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorized foreign military activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential military threat, and to date no "unidentified flying object" sighting has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported incident.
 3. The alleged incidents referred to in the 1981 memorandum occurred between 27-29 December 1980 when unusual lights were seen by USAF personnel, including the Deputy Base Commander, outside RAF Woodbridge. A report of the sighting written some two weeks after the events (copy attached) was forwarded to the MOD by the RAF Liaison Officer at RAF Bentwaters. The report was examined by the Department at the time and no evidence of any matter of defence significance was found. This is of course the Department's only interest in such sightings.
 4. This incident is regularly quoted by the media and 'ufologists' as evidence of "UFOs" penetrating the UK Air Defence Region. However, all available evidence was examined at the time and nothing of defence concern was judged to have occurred in the location on the nights in question. No additional information has come to light over the last 16½ years which calls the original judgement into question.
- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5. It was then, and continues to be the case that witnesses are not routinely contacted following receipt of a "UFO" report. It would only have been necessary to contact Lt Col Halt (or any other witness) had there been any indication that the sighting was of defence relevance and further information was required.

6. The PQs may have been prompted by the publication of two books, one on "UFOs" and the other on "Alien Abductions" by a former member of Sec(AS), Mr Nicholas Pope. The incident is discussed in Mr Pope's first book. He states that the radiation readings taken by USAF personnel at the site were unusually high. There is, however, no evidence that any analysis of the radiation readings reported at the site was undertaken at the time. It can only be assumed now that in view of the assessment made at the time by the relevant air defence experts that the UK air defence region had not been compromised, no analysis of the reported readings was judged necessary.

[REDACTED]

approached the Defence Radiological Protection Service in 1994 for their views. Their advice was that the readings were higher than normal but that there could be a number of explanations for this.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS 81ST COMBAT SUPPORT GROUP (USAF)
APO NEW YORK 09755



REPLY TO
ATTN OF: CD

13 Jan 81

SUBJECT: Unexplained Lights

TO: RAF/CC

1. Early in the morning of 27 Dec 80 (approximately 0300L), two USAF security police patrolmen saw unusual lights outside the back gate at RAF Woodbridge. Thinking an aircraft might have crashed or been forced down, they called for permission to go outside the gate to investigate. The on-duty flight chief responded and allowed three patrolmen to proceed on foot. The individuals reported seeing a strange glowing object in the forest. The object was described as being metallic in appearance and triangular in shape, approximately two to three meters across the base and approximately two meters high. It illuminated the entire forest with a white light. The object itself had a pulsing red light on top and a bank(s) of blue lights underneath. The object was hovering or on legs. As the patrolmen approached the object, it maneuvered through the trees and disappeared. At this time the animals on a nearby farm went into a frenzy. The object was briefly sighted approximately an hour later near the back gate.

2. The next day, three depressions 1 1/2" deep and 7" in diameter were found where the object had been sighted on the ground. The following night (29 Dec 80) the area was checked for radiation. Beta/gamma readings of 0.1 milliroentgens were recorded with peak readings in the three depressions and near the center of the triangle formed by the depressions. A nearby tree had moderate (.05-.07) readings on the side of the tree toward the depressions.

3. Later in the night a red sun-like light was seen through the trees. It moved about and pulsed. At one point it appeared to throw off glowing particles and then broke into five separate white objects and then disappeared. Immediately thereafter, three star-like objects were noticed in the sky; two objects to the north and one to the south, all of which were about 10° off the horizon. The objects moved rapidly in sharp angular movements and displayed red, green and blue lights. The objects to the north appeared to be elliptical through an 8-12 power lens. They then turned to full circles. The objects to the north remained in the sky for an hour or more. The object to the south was visible for two or three hours and beamed down a stream of light from time to time. Numerous individuals, including the undersigned, witnessed the activities in paragraphs 2 and 3.


CHARLES I. HALT, Lt Col, USAF
Deputy Base Commander

- The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Ministry of Defence replied to the 1981 memorandum from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt, which reported the presence of an unidentified craft that had landed in close proximity to RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge, witnessed by United States Air Force personnel; and if not, why not. [31st July]
- The Lord Hill-Norton - To ask Her Majesty's Government how the radiation readings reported to the Ministry of Defence by Lieutenant Colonel Charles Halt in his memorandum dated 13th January 1981 compare to the normal levels of background radiation in Rendelsham Forest. [31st July]

A N S W E R

(The Lord Gilbert)

The memorandum, which reported observations of unusual lights in the sky, was assessed by staff in my Department responsible for air defence matters. Since the judgement was that it contained nothing of defence significance no further action was taken.

There is no record of any official assessment of the radiation readings reported by Lieutenant Colonel Halt. From a Defence perspective, some 16½ years after the alleged events, there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment now.

Ministry of Defence

August 1997

0861I/0862I

**Section 40****From:** **Section 40****Sent:** 09 August 2007 14:33**To:** **Section 40****Subject:** Release-authorized: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST - 06-08-2007-142629-001Dear **Section 40**

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 4 August 2007 asking whether the internal review into a Freedom of Information request from a member of the public (as mentioned in an e-mail of 29 November 2006) upheld the original MoD decision.

I can confirm that it did.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>> ."

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

06-08-2007-142629-001

evl 3 Sep 07

Section 40

From: Section 40
 Sent: 04 August 2007 09:07
 To: Section 40
 Subject: Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 03-08-2007-110116-004

Section 40

Thank you for this reply, stating that Section 40 (Personal Information) precludes release of the response to the internal review mentioned in your 29 November 2006 (11:35) email to Section 40. Without releasing a copy of the response itself, are you able to say whether or not the review upheld the original decision, or led to the release of any further documents? If so, please let me know. But if you believe this too is covered by Section 40, I shall take the matter no further.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course on the other matters raised in my email to you dated 3 July 2007 (15:22). While the overall aim of this email was to set up a consistent and mutually-convenient consultation process in respect of any FOI requests that might be categorised as "personal requests", I am not sure I entirely agree that these matters were not themselves RFIs. To clarify, if any further FOI requests have been received that fall within the scope of paragraphs 3 and paragraphs 4 a, b and c of my 3 July email, I would want to see copies of them and of any related documentation.

Best wishes,

Section 40

----- Original Message -----

From: Section 40
 To: Section 40
 Sent: Friday, August 03, 2007 11:35 AM
 Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 03-08-2007-110116-004

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 3 July 2007 asking for copies of the response to an internal review undertaken by the Directorate of Information Exploitation into a Freedom of Information request from a member of the public, as mentioned in an e-mail from DAS-FOI dated 29 November 2006. You also raised a number of other matters that were not requests for information. These will be dealt with separately in due course.

The Freedom of Information Act 2000 is designed to cover information held by public bodies. However, the results of any internal review conducted at the request of a member of the public, are a private matter between the MoD and the individual. The information you request is therefore withheld under exemption s.40 (Personal Information).

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act.

06/08/2007

Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk> <<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

Finally, please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to your request. It had been hoped to respond to all the matters that you raised in your e-mail in the same response, but unfortunately this has not been possible due to pressure of work, hence the delay.

Section 40


DAS-FOI

05-H-**Section 40**

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 08 August 2007 16:02

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-Authorised: FOI Request - 07-08-2007-101513-001

Dear Section 40

I am writing with reference to your report of an 'unidentified flying object' seen on 4 August 2007, and your request for information on this particular sighting. This office is the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFO's.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

The Ministry of Defence does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial life forms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date, the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

With regard to your particular observation, and the question of any other member of the public reporting the incident to this office, I can confirm that no other reports were received regarding your incident, but one other report was received for the same date from Hemel Hempstead in Hertfordshire.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1
5th Floor, Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

08/08/2007

Section 40

EXP 5 Jul 07

From: Section 40
Sent: 07 August 2007 10:18
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 07-08-2007-101513-001 Section 40
Categories: FOI Information Request

Section 40

RFI assigned as requested.

Regards

Section 40
FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 06 August 2007 20:26
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 07-08-2007-101513-001 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Monday, August 6, 2007 at 20:26:04

txttitle: Section 40
txtfirstname: Section 40
txtlastname:
txtaddress1:
txtaddress2:
txttowncity: Sheffield
txtstatecountry: South Yorkshire
txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40
txtcountry: UK
txtemailAddress: Section 40

txtinforequest: I am sending this to you as not sure were else to send it, have e-mailed 2 local radio stations but have had now response.
We live in Sheffield and on Saturday 4th August around 10.45pm we spotted 2 strange objects in the sky, followed by 3 others. We can only describe them as very bright fire coloured, spinning and moving very fast across the sky, when looking through binoculars it was like looking into a light shade and seeing the bulb. There was no engine noise at all.
We are genuine people and were very curious. We wondered if you have any other reports for the same evening.
We would appreciate if this is not the correct department, that you forward it on, Thank You.
We wait in anticipation



AUTHORISATION FOR THE RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Applicant: **Section 40**

Case Number: 24-07-2007-124317-002 Expiry: 14 Aug 07

The Applicant has made the following request for information:

Copies of sighting reports and correspondence for UFOs in Scotland 1999-2007

Case for release of information

There is no reason to withhold the information.

A small amount of information that could identify the individual has been withheld under exemption s.40(Personal Information)

Authorisation

I hereby give authorisation to release the aforementioned information to the Applicant.

Grade/Rank: B2 Name: **Section 40**
..... **Section 40**
Authorisation Reference Number: DAS-FOI 08/05.....
Date: 8/8/07



From: **Section 40**

Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000

e-mail

das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Section 40

Our Reference
24-07-2007-124317-002

Date
8 August 2007

Edinburgh

Section 40

Dear **Section 40**

Further to my letter of 26 July 2007 enclosing copies of photographs of alleged UFOs, please find attached the remaining letter that I promised.

A small amount of information such as names, addresses, and telephone numbers has been removed under exemption s.40 (Personal Information). I have also withheld other personal information that could be used to identify the individual under the same exemption.


If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within two calendar months of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

1 of 3



DAS	
102N6	
29 JUN 2006	
FILE	

Sir;

I have been browsing here and there in your much publicised 400 page "Freedom of Information" and feel impelled to comment, after MANY years of actual involvement one to one...with what we still call "UFO"'s although I now feel that "The Visitors" would be a more apt description.

In March 1960 I was a humble [redacted] on my local [redacted] "debit", and crossing a railway bridge in the town. My left eye was caught by a glint in the bright, clear, cold, and windy sky. I looked at it and saw a "cigar" shaped object apparently hovering at about a thousand feet. I looked hard at it and decided it was an aircraft fighting a very strong wind from the north east. A young man passed by, pushing his bike. I asked him if he thought the object was a 'plane. He looked, and said yes, it WAS a 'plane. Satisfied, I walked on. The word "flying saucer" has flicked across my mind but was dismissed. I'd read about such in the press etc., had an open mind about it. Five years in the wartime RAF had given me much food for thought subsequently. Why not? I had been, still am, an "expert" on aircraft recognition. Prewar I was in the AIR TRAINING CORP and stationed on an aircraft Factory roof at Fareham, where I worked at 16, as its "spotter", during the early war years, I pressed the buzzer and got some 100 workers into our shelter as the sound and then the brief glimpse of two Junkers JU 88s breaking low cloud was followed by bomb explosions and then AA batteries...too late! HMS COLLINGWOOD was a huge naval training base just a mile or so away. We learnt, later that a number of Wrens etc had been lining up for their Friday payday. Identification had been too late. Not unusual confusion with our own Blenheim Bombers. The death toll was appalling. I actually lived just a few hundred yards away from the establishment.

Relevant on that 1960 March morning? As I heard the roar of jet engines thirty minutes after my initial sighting while talking to a client I ran to a vantage point as two Meteor jets hove into view low over the rooftops, heading up where, to my amazement, the "plane" was still hovering. I KNEW then it was no aircraft! Those jets had been "scrambled" from a nearby airbase. As the aircraft drew near the object, it lazily turned on end in the clear blue sky and vanished! I ran into a nearby phone box. Found the number for Thorney Island Airbase, got the control tower officer, gave him my name and address, asked him what was the object those two Meteor jets were chasing?

His answer changed my life, at 30 odd

years of age. `You saw no object, you saw no jets` I tried again. Precisely the same answer. I left that phone box my mind in a whirl. Cold War Russian surveillance aircraft? It had been over a very sensitive Admiralty Air Surface Weapons Establishment. (ASWE)

Next day my then brother in law called in on a social visit. Coincidence? Much later in life I LEARNT about "coincidences"> Jung called them "synchronicities".

My wife went out to the kitchen to make a cup of tea for our visitor. WHO WORKED AT ASWE! Indulging in "small talk" I said; `You had some excitement over your place yesterday morning` His face went grey. Then WHITE. His mouth set in a grimline. He never spoke. NEVER DID! I changed the subject.

On subsequent visits over the years he never brought the subject up as my "library" of "flying Saucer" books grew and even when I appeared on Southern TV speaking on "flying saucers".

So, you see, all is relevant. All is "connected". I mean, WHO did I go to in authority after that on the spot refusal? But I KNEW! For ever! To this day. The photographic proof lies in your hands. YOU don't want it. YOU KNOW. But SCARED TO TELL US...the PEOPLE, THE WORLD.

My 400 page manuscript lies in my dusty bookcase. Another 400 pages will say "THE END". Or WILL IT? That 1960 incident appeared in top author Nick Redfern's splendid FACTUAL best seller in 1997 under "A COVERT AGENDA"...FACTS from the OFFICIAL REPORTS.

He has written others. None equal that first one. He wrote in it at a book presentation; `To [REDACTED]. Hope you enjoy the book and thanks for your help`

MY HELP? Of course, why not? He was telling us, me, there were many others having the same experiences. He put me on to his publisher. No joy there. You see, by then, 1997, I'd had MORE sightings..afresh in 1977 and 1978 One with other witnesses five miles away. Another that I didn't recognise with my then wife in 1978...also with a close by neighbour whose story appeared in my local Southampton Daily Echo. The last of THREE in that January 1978 period I was given a swift trip around the Solar system! Funny, I thought! Odd too. I started my own small UFO Group...two ladies and myself. Applicants HAD TO HAVE HAD ACTUAL EXPERIENCES. Together we had many more, even stranger. Odd dreams, I "became" a "healer.. We had "spiritual" experiences. "Sittings" and "spiritual" visits to church or churches produced more awesome incidents. I spoke in public, on radio, TV, on such. Read books that equalled in content what I was going through...AFTER I'd had them.

To sum up what is an ongoing and LONG LONG LONG story. Although I believe the end, the conclusion, is not far off. Why? How?

Cast your eye over a selection of photos. Remember our UFO group has had videos shown to the MOD top man Sir Lewis Mooney a few years back,made into a very good BBC HORIZON "Paranormal" series, featured our local Police Spotter plane encircling (twice) a strange object hovering and moving over Southampton Water in 2001 and 2002 with dates almost to the same day. Totally denied first of all by ALL local authorities. Eventually confirmed by Police Spotter unit,times,locations,confirmed. However, the crews 'saw nothing'. 'Possibly Jupiter.' Which I thought was pretty good technology for a humble spotter plane,and said so. Later certain matters confirmed the TRUTH as we knew and filmed it.

'Course,you may not KNOW all this. Then again.....?

OK Had enough?

I'll just leave you to ponder. Much as the total SILENCE from the media ...even from dear old [redacted] whose first wad of photos earlier this year he thought 'fascinating' but the very recent ones...particularly the "humanoid" has brought WEEKS OF NO REACTION. I suggested 'awesome' might be more apt this time.

Sincerely

[redacted signature block]

PS; Oh,yes...mustn't forget the 12 abductions accompanied (3) witnessed (3) and"visitations"1932, then 1978 and onwards,last ones June 04, scars and photo of two still visible or on photo.

[redacted] 7
19/6/06



From: Section 40
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) Section 40
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk

Section 40

Our Reference
24-07-2007-124317-002

Date
26 July 2007

Edinburgh

Section 40

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 27 July 2007 asking for copies of any photographs of alleged UFOs held by the MoD for the year 2006. Additionally, you asked for copies of any related reports or correspondence.

Please find attached copies of photographs and relevant correspondence. I have not included newspaper cuttings that members of the public have sent us. You should note that the MoD does not hold the copyright on these photographs which may actually lay with the individuals that sent them to the MoD and if that is the case, you should take all reasonable steps to protect that copyright, particularly if you intend to publish or disseminate them further. You will also notice that two of the photographs feature individuals whose faces have been obscured in order to comply with the Data Protection Act 1998.

A small amount of information such as names, addresses, and telephone numbers has been removed under exemption s.40 (Personal Information). As you have made it clear that speed is of the essence, I have withheld a letter from a member of the public whilst I seek advice on its correct handling under the Freedom of Information Act. This matter will be resolved within the deadlines imposed by the Act, but I did not wish to delay sending the rest of the information to you.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within two calendar months of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.


If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>."

Yours sincerely,

Section 40



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk **Section 40**



Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
12 July 2006

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing in response to your letter dated 19 June regarding the release of the Ministry of Defence report entitled "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK Air Defence Region" and your comments about your own UFO sightings.

As you will be aware from previous correspondence, the MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms. We remain totally open-minded, but to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena. We do not doubt that individuals observe phenomenon that they are unable to identify, but believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them. It is not, however, the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

With regard to your comments about the content of the Ministry of Defence UAP report, I can advise you that the study was conducted purely to establish whether the UFO sighting reports received by the MOD were of any value to the Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) and whether there was a requirement for the DIS to see them in the future. Given the conclusion it was decided that there was no such requirement and, since December 2000, UFO reports have not been forwarded to the DIS. We appreciate that there may be those who disagree with the report's findings, but the MOD is satisfied that its conclusions are sufficient for defence needs.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

10/1/2010
10/1/2010
10/1/2010
10/1/2010



2.5.06 (C) Section 40 SUFOG

13.57 Refer to "humanoid" photos. same date. time.

2.5.20

8.4.06 16.28 (C) Section 40 UFOG

Through [Section 40] Towards Port's Mouth Harbour

Window 1042 (A/M/R)




Section 40

50706

2018/05

08/03




SUFOQ

26/8/05 13:44
enlarged




THE FIRST ONE
26.8.05





4/11/05 Copyright Section 40 SUFOG





Section 40

UFG

10.8.08

11.15 10.3.08

100000 SWH



Section 40

[Redacted]

UFG

over HMS VICTORY - see "marines" photo
copyright [Redacted] UFG

Section 40


[Redacted]

UFG

13.3.08
11.4.08

9-11-05
14+06





①

13 / 06 ②

13 : 25

PORTSMOUTH Harbour
Spring

Section 40

PORTSMOUTH HARBOUR
Spring

Section 40

2008

10/10/10
10/10/10
10/10/10
10/10/10
10/10/10


Section 40





3000

11700

10/10/10
10/10/10
10/10/10
10/10/10
10/10/10



1115
17000



Auebury Trussee 2004



Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing concerning your email of 8 May regarding 'unidentified flying objects'. Your message has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence about UFOs.

It may be helpful if I explain that the MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms. We remain totally open-minded but to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena. The MOD examines any reports of 'UFOs' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

With regard to your particular observations, we are satisfied that there is no corroborating evidence to suggest that the United Kingdom's airspace has been breached by unauthorised aircraft.

If you wish to see information about UFOs which has been released to the public from MOD records, please look at the MOD website <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>. There is also information available for public viewing at The National Archives. Details can be found on their website at <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
5th Floor, Zone H [REDACTED] Section 40
Main Building
Whitehall
LONDON
SW1A 2HB

e-mail: das-ufo-office@mod.uk

26 May 2006

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

10271-
DAS

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



Law Fly by / Ufo / E-MAIL

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To DAS (LA) P+P

TO Ref No 3542 / 2006

cc.

Date 10 - 5. 06 .

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

Most correspondence involves some form of request for information – even if it is only a request for clarification of Government policy – and is therefore covered by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) from January 2005. In general, if you meet the deadline for responding to correspondence, and comply with any requests for information, there is no need to do anything differently as this will meet the requirements of the Act. However, if the correspondence requests information which is not already in the public domain, and which might need to be withheld, then you should treat it as a FOIA request, track it using the Access to Information toolkit, and comply with the separate FOI guidance from DG Info (see <http://aitportal/default.aspx> for details). However, the deadline for responding to correspondence will still apply. If you are in any doubt as to whether a piece of correspondence should be treated as an FOIA request, you should ask your FOI Focal Point or refer to the guidance produced by DG Info.

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

[Redacted]

[Redacted] DII: Ministerial Correspondence; [Redacted]

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_pari/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

✓

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 May 2006 18:58
To: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: ufos are intelligently driven craft and are not man-made

Dear Minister

It is a fallacy for the government to assume that these vehicles aren't piloted by intelligences. These photos were taken by me and my husband. On both occasions, the crafts were invisible. The reason that I knew where they were as I sensed them and was directed where to point the camera. Natural phenomenon is incapable of that sort of communication. The one over the church tower was taken in the middle of the afternoon over St Saviours Church, Magdalene Street Norwich and there were plenty of people who could have seen it had it wanted to do so.

The second one was taken over my flat. The pink shield like object at the bottom. I sensed the craft was like a living organism, but intelligences were inside of it, (biomechanical).

I have had experiences with these craft and their occupants from the age of four. I remember seeing the greys, and having thought I imagined them by the bed. It wasn't until I woke up the next morning with a small pin hole in my navel and it leaking that I knew something happened. I was married to a man in the military at the time and I had to military officers, who were doctors questioning me at length demanding to know who done the surgical procedure on me. As far as, I am concerned, I just lost a little bit of dna with that encounter. No real harm done and no long term psychological damage. I was much more distressed by the military doctors abrupt questioning than the incident itself.

I have always come back intact. However, I have developed a sixth sense, as it were, or they somehow communicate to me where to point the camera. Two days before the photograph of the craft over the church, I had had a dream interrupted where a tall, white being communicated to me.

There is no hostility associated with their presence in our atmosphere. Then again, we did invite them with the Voyager craft in the 70's.

However, I don't like my intelligence being insulted by telling me that these beings do not exist and they are not visiting. We send craft out there; is mankind's ego so big that it can't handle visitors taking an interest in our planet.

Earth is a beautiful planet and is a living organism in itself. It is a contrast to see the beauty marred by violence, bloodshed, hunger, rape, etc, etc. The bombs used in warfare are as detrimental to the environment, as the carbons emitted by cars. By warring with each other, we are not only destroying ourselves, but our planet. Global Warming can't solely be blamed on pollutants, cars, and toxins. Weapons of war contribute to the planet's health.

Besides, if we have any hope of reaching the furthest planets and meeting our neighbours outside of our solar system, then we need to take into account that if we are to achieve that goal that we must unite in peace and find a common goal.

They are visiting us without interference, or hostility. Would we be so peaceful, or we would just go and take whatever we want from another civilisation and strip it of its minerals and destroy its people and its environment like we are doing to our own.


thank you for taking the time to read this.

My full address is at the bottom of this email.


[REDACTED]

09/05/2006

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



Express yourself instantly with MSN Messenger! [MSN Messenger](#)







Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing in response to your e-mail of 23 March concerning lights seen near your home over the past three years. Your message has been passed to this department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence about Unidentified Flying Objects. I apologise for the delay in responding.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial life-forms. We remain totally open-minded, but to date we know of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena. The Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

I can assure you that the integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Policing Area would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might if deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft). From that perspective, reports provided to us of 'UFO' sightings are examined, but consultation with air defence staff and others as necessary is considered only where there is sufficient evidence to suggest a breach of UK air space. The vast majority of reports we receive are very sketchy and vague. Only a handful of reports in recent years have warranted further investigation and none revealed any evidence of a threat.

With regard to your comments concerning the presents of low flying military helicopters in the vicinity shortly after you saw an orange light, I should inform you that low flying training takes place throughout the UK and is not connected to UFO sightings. One of the main roles of military helicopters is to provide close support to ground forces. In the event of conflict helicopters would have to fly at very low levels to reinforce troops in the field undetected by highly developed radar systems. Low level training for helicopters generally takes place at heights below 500 feet down to ground level. Helicopters are vulnerable to ground fire and one of the vital skills which must be acquired by the pilots is flying as closely as possible to the nap of the earth so that the aircraft is shielded and camouflaged by the features of the terrain. This is a perishable skill that needs to be practiced regularly. This type of training is therefore spread as thinly as possible throughout the UK so as not to concentrate activity over one area and to keep disturbance to the public to a minimum. I am sorry if this training has caused disturbance to you.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
5th Floor, Zone H, Section 40
Main Building
Whitehall
LONDON

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

DAS
102M
27 MAR 2006
FILE



Leads flying / ufos /E-MAIL

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To DAS (A) R/P
cc.

TO Ref No 2475 /2006

Date 24-3-06

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

Most correspondence involves some form of request for information – even if it is only a request for clarification of Government policy – and is therefore covered by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) from January 2005. In general, if you meet the deadline for responding to correspondence, and comply with any requests for information, there is no need to do anything differently as this will meet the requirements of the Act. However, if the correspondence requests information which is not already in the public domain, and which might need to be withheld, then you should treat it as a FOIA request, track it using the Access to Information toolkit, and comply with the separate FOI guidance from DG Info (see <http://aitportal/default.aspx> for details). However, the deadline for responding to correspondence will still apply. If you are in any doubt as to whether a piece of correspondence should be treated as an FOIA request, you should ask your FOI Focal Point or refer to the guidance produced by DG Info.

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Ministerial Correspondence; e: [REDACTED]

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://min.defence.mod.uk/min_pari/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.





From:
Sent: 23 March 2006 08:24
To: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: Disturbing Lights and Craft




UFO's and Aliens
(28).jpg (1 M...

Please take notice of this message as it is very serious and i feel has very much importance.


Dear MOD

I have witnessed some stran and disturbing aircraft in the vicinity of my home in the past three years. I have seen strange triangular craft, strange fleets of small lights and light balls and most recently a strange orange object that seemed to appear behind me out of nowhere. I am concerned that these are not aircraft owned by the RAF and would like to know what they are. Do you own Triangle craft that make no noise of an engine? I would like to know because as a British citizen I have a right to know. I know that you know there are strange things in the skies as when I sighted the orange light shortly after the military was here as I saw two low flying helicopters pass over at a very very low altitude you would think the helicopters were landing in my back garden with the sound made. As the MOD you should tell us what is going on outside our very own homes. If you wish to contact me further to discuss this issue please do. I have enclosed one of my pictures of a light ball craft i have witnessed i think you will agree how amazing the picture is.

Regards,







From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) [REDACTED]
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]
e-mail das-ufo-office@mod.uk **Section 40**

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date

28th September 2006

Dear [REDACTED]


I am writing in response to your letter concerning lights that you have seen over Glasgow. I apologise for the delay in replying.

The MOD examines any reports such as yours solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit

I have viewed your video and am content that it contains nothing of defence concern but it has been placed on file.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



To: [REDACTED] c/o Ministry of Defence ✓

From: [REDACTED]

Thank you for your response to FICM
Regarding objects over Glasgow's West
End. I honestly don't think the objects
are natural phenomena so I am concerned
that the objects could not be traced
on radar. I am not thinking along the
lines of U.F.O.' I was thinking the object

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

YOU SAW AT THE START OF THE LAST FILM
LOOKED VERY MUCH LIKE SOME SORT OF
NUCLEAR WEAPON. ALTHOUGH IM NOT AN
EXPERT, ENCLOSED YOU WILL FIND A FILM
1 HR $\frac{1}{2}$ OF FOOTAGE OF VARIOUS OBJECTS
FILMED IN 2004. I HAVE PLACED THE TAPE
WHERE YOU SEE WHAT LOOKS LIKE SOME SORT
OF CRAFT ONLY THIS TIME THE OBJECT
IS JUST ABOVE ROOFTOPS OF THE HOOPER
ALONG GLASGOWS CLYDESIDE. PLEASE EXCUSE
FILM IS NOT STEADY DUE TO THE ANGLE I WAS FILMING

ALSO ENCLOSED PHOTOGRAPH
OF OBJECT NEAR TELEPHONE
COMMUNICATION WIRES IN THE
STREET THIS WAS TAKEN IN 2004.



Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing with reference to your e.mail dated 2 September 2006, for which you sent to our ufo-das-office e.mail address.

With regard to the UFO photographs, thank you, but as mentioned in previous correspondence, we do not attempt to identify pictures of UFOs, and do not investigate into sighting reports that we receive. However, I did take a look at the photographs, but could not make out as to what the images could be. As stated before, some sightings could be put down to natural phenomena.

Finally, you mentioned that you had not had a reply from your previous FOI request dated 23 August. This office has 20 days in which to complete requests and sometimes questions require investigation, so can take longer. You will receive a reply in due course.

Hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1
5th Floor, Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk

4/9/06

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 02 September 2006 18:52
To: DAS-UFO-Office
Subject: Fwd: Ufo photo's

These were forwarded to me by an associate of mine. These pictures were taken over Heathrow Airport last Halloween, it lasted for a few hours. Would it be possible for you to have a look and tell me what you think of them? P.S. have still had no reply to my last FOI request?

Kind Regards [Redacted]

[REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT



From: [REDACTED]



Sent: 26 August 2006 01:09



To: [REDACTED]


Subject: Ufo photo's

Hey [REDACTED] its [REDACTED] here ufo hunter lets see if I can send these pics to you ok, let me know if they come out ok and indeed what you think about the images, cheers (see how it changes shape from pic to pic)









EXP - 21 AUG 07

Section 40

From: Section 40
 Sent: 24 July 2007 12:13
 To: Section 40
 Subject: RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 18-07-2007-111138-006

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your prompt response.

I am indeed interested in the alleged UFO photographs for 2006.

I would be grateful if you were able to send copies of them to me - along with any related reports or correspondence if possible.

Many thanks

Section 40

Section 40 senior reporter (news), Section 40
 Section 40 Edinburgh, Section 40

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
 Sent: 23 July 2007 11:39
 To: Section 40
 Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST 18-07-2007-111138-006

Dear Section 40

Thank you for Freedom of Information request of 17 July 2007 requesting copies of photographs or videos purporting to be of Unidentified Aerial Phenomena or Unidentified Flying Objects held by the MoD for the period 1980-2007. Additionally, you asked for copies of any related reports or correspondence. It has been passed to this branch to answer as we are the lead branch on UFO matters.

If they are retained, (and they are often returned to owners) copies of UFO photographs etc are stored on our normal paper files, together with any sighting reports or correspondence, in the date order in which they are received. To comply with your request would require a manual search of those records, the cost of which would exceed the permitted £600 limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and, as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with the request. However, if you restricted your request to one or two specific years, we may be in a position to help. We have recently answered a request for copies of alleged UFO photographs for 2006. If you are interested, please e-mail a response and I will send you copies.

Additionally, as I mentioned in my response to your request 18-07-2007-110343-004, our files for the period 1967-1984 have been transferred to the National Archive and it is quite likely they contain alleged UFO/UAP photographs.

If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail Info-XD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>
<<http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk/>> ."

I am sorry I could not be of more assistance.

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H Section 40

MoD Main Building

London

SW1A 2HB

Section 40 Registered in Scotland no. SC015382
53 Manor Place, Edinburgh, EH3 7EG

Registered Office:

Opinions expressed in this email are those of the writer and not the company. E-mail traffic is monitored within Johnston Press and messages may be viewed. This e-mail and any files with it are solely for the use of the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this e-mail in error. Please delete it or return it to the sender or notify us by email at postmaster@jpress.co.uk

Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 25 July 2007 14:58

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-authorised: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST FROM JOURNALIST

Dear Section 40

As a courtesy, I wish to inform you that I have received a Freedom of Information request from a journalist for copies of photographs of alleged UFOs for the period 2006, together with any associated correspondence.

As you will recall, in June 2006, you wrote to the MoD enclosing a number of photographs and cuttings from local newspapers. Your letter outlined a UFO experience you had in 1960.

Under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, I am obliged to release copies of the photographs and correspondence. The photographs are marked as being copyrighted by yourself and the journalist will be informed of this in any response I send him. It is normal practice for the MoD to withhold the names and personal details of people that correspond with us. However, in view of your position as Section 40 Section 40 for SUFOG, I should be grateful if you would confirm that you wish your name to be withheld, or whether you wish it to be released. Additionally, if you would actually like to contact the journalist, whilst I am unable to give you his name for the same reasons of privacy that protect you, I am prepared to pass on your contact details to him.

We also hold a number of local newspaper clippings that you sent us which also show alleged UFOs together with your name and photograph. I should be grateful if you would inform me whether you are content for these to also be passed to the journalist.

I should emphasise that the MoD will withhold your personal details unless you specifically tell us otherwise. This decision is entirely yours and you should not feel in anyway pressurised one way or the other.

It would be helpful if you could make any response by e-mail.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

DAS-FOI

05-H-Section 40

Ministry of Defence

Whitehall

London

SW1A 2HB

25/07/2007



From: **Section 40**
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

Section 40

Wrexham
North Wales
Section 40

Your Reference:

Our Reference:
01-08-2007-105617-010
Date:
6 August 2007

Dear **Section 40**

I am writing concerning your Freedom of Information request asking for any UFO reports and information relating to North Wales over the last ten years. Your request has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFOs.'

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

With regard to your request for UFO reports/information relating to North East Wales in the last ten years, I have checked my records so far for 2007 and there have been no sighting reports for North East Wales and in particular – Wrexham. As to the last ten years, the Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website has a database which contains this information you require. This can be accessed via the internet at:

<http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports.

Turning to your general request, to sighting reports in living memory from North East Wales, I should inform you that MOD records are not held electronically, but are filed on paper files in the order in which they are received and we currently hold records spanning a 25 year period. They are not segregated by geographical area. To identify records specifically from North East Wales and Wrexham, a manual search would be required, and the costs to do this would exceed the

permitted £600 cost limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, and as provided by Section 12 of the Act, therefore, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may wish to take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the internal process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40



Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 01 August 2007 11:41
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 01-08-2007-105617-010 Section 40

Categories: FOI Information Request

New one

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 01 August 2007 10:57
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 01-08-2007-105617-010 Section 40

Section 40

Can I interest you with this FOI request?

Regards

Section 40
FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 01 August 2007 09:32
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 01-08-2007-105617-010 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Wednesday, August 1, 2007 at 09:31:40

txttitle: Section 40
txtfirstname: Section 40
txtlastname: Section 40
txtoccupation: Reporter
txtorganisation: Section 40
txtaddress1: Section 40
txtaddress2: Section 40
txttowncity: Wrexham
txtstatecountry: Wrexham
txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40
txtcountry: UK
txttelephone: Section 40
txtinforequest: I would like any UFO reports/information relating to North East Wales, in particular the Wrexham area, over the past 10 years or so and any with more than one or two 'sightings' in living memory.



Section 40

From: Section 40

Sent: 06 August 2007 11:37

To: Section 40

Subject: Release-Authorised: FOI Request - 01-08-2007-105203-009

Dear Section 40

I am writing concerning your Freedom of Information request asking for the number and details of sightings that have been made from Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill, Primrose Hill, and Alexandra Palace/Alexandra Park.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

With regard to your request, for UFO sighting reports from Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill, Primrose Hill and Alexandra Palace, in the last few decades, I have checked my records for so far in 2007, and have found no sighting reports for these areas. As to the last few decades, I should inform you that MOD records are not held electronically, but are filed on paper files in the order in which they are received and we currently hold records spanning a 25 year period. They are not segregated by geographical area. To identify records specifically for the information from that areas that you require, would require a manual search and the costs to do this would exceed the permitted £600 cost limit set for compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, and as provided by Section 12 of the Act, the Ministry of Defence is not obliged to comply with your request. However, the Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information website has a database which contains UFO sighting reports for the last 9 years, and this can be accessed via the internet at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/FreedomOfInformation/PublicationScheme>, by searching under 'UFO' reports.

Finally, you may also wish to be aware that the MOD has already released a great deal of information about UFOs which is available for public viewing. MOD files were routinely destroyed after 5 years until 1967 when they were generally preserved for The National Archives. A few have survived before 1967 and these together with records up to 1984 are now available for public viewing. The National Archives can be contacted at Ruskin Avenue, Richmond, Kew, Surrey TW9 4DU or telephone, 020 8876 3444. The National Archives also have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

I hope this is helpful. If you are unhappy with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of this request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Director of Information Exploitation, 6th Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall SW1A 2HB (e-mail InfoXD@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate the case until the internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

06/08/2007

Section 40

From: Section 40
Sent: 01 August 2007 11:53
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 01-08-2007-105203-009 Section 40

Categories: FOI Information Request

-----Original Message-----

From: Section 40
Sent: 01 August 2007 10:54
To: Section 40
Subject: FW: FOI written request PS 01-08-2007-105203-009 Section 40

Section 40

Can I interest you with this FOI request?

Regards

Section 40

FOI Helpdesk

-----Original Message-----

From: feedback@www.mod.uk [mailto:feedback@www.mod.uk]
Sent: 01 August 2007 10:21
To: Info-Access-Office
Subject: FOI written request PS 01-08-2007-105203-009 Section 40

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted on Wednesday, August 1, 2007 at 10:20:56

txttitle: Section 40
txtfirstname: Section 40
txtlastname:
txtoccupation: Journalist
txtorganisation: Section 40
txtaddress1: Section 40
txtaddress2: Hampstead
txttowncity: London
txtstatecountry: London
txtzipcodepostcode: Section 40
txtcountry: UK
txtemailAddress: Section 40
txttelephone: Section 40

txtinforequest: I understand the MoD is opening up its files on UFO sightings over the past few decades. I would like to know how many sightings have been made from Hampstead Heath / Parliament Hill and from Primrose Hill in north London. Details on what was reportedly seen would also be useful. In addition, similar information about sightings made from Alexandra Palace / Alexandra Park.

Floor, Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

E.mail – das-ufo-office@mod.uk